

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
1.001	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		Given the ACWS program size and complexity, highly experienced key personnel are essential to the success (or risk) of the program. Would the Government consider requiring key personnel resumes as part of Sub Factor 2 Management Capabilities?	Key Personnel	RFP Change. See revised Section L, M, SOO and Attch_0015 where "Key Personnel" Changed to "Key Personnel/Key Positions" and added clarifying language. No Resumes required. Revised L.4.2.1.5, Attch_0001 SOO para. 6.1 d) Personnel Management and the instructions for Attch_0015_ACWS_Staff_Level_Skills_Mix_Schedule_2016_04_04.xlsx. "Key Personnel/Key Positions" are Contractor identified.
1.011			16	13	5.7 Government Surveillance Metrics	The Surveillance Matrix paragraph references the Performance Outcomes and Services (Table 2). Please provide Table 2 or the list of six performance standards that must that must be performed by the contractor.	QASP	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0016 Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan, Table 2, Surveillance Matrix: Performance Outcomes and Required Services, was added in Section 5.7.
1.021			16	13	5.7 Government Surveillance Metrics	The Surveillance Matrix paragraph references the Processes/Products (Table 3). Please provide Table 3 or the list of seven process /product groups of CDRLs and standards that must be delivered by the contractor.	QASP	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0016 Quality Assurance Plan. Table 3, Surveillance Matrix: Processes/Products, was added in Section 5.7
1.031			16	11	5.3	Paragraph 5.3 of Attachment 16, the QASP, states that "The Performance Requirements Matrix below includes the performance standards." We are unable to locate the referenced matrix or to find the referenced performance standards. Please provide guidance where the referenced matrix is provided and if not included, please provide.	Clarification of requirements	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0016 Quality Assurance Plan. Table 2, Surveillance Matrix: Performance Outcomes and Required Services, and Table 3, Surveillance Matrix: Processes/Products, were added in Section 5.7
1.041	M		29	35	M.3.2.1.5.1	This section states that "The Government will confirm that at least one (1) of the "Key Personnel" proposed is a presenter. More than one "Key Personnel" participating is preferred.", however, the Section L requirement for Key Personnel that was in the draft RFP was removed. Would the government please clarify the evaluation criteria.	Clarification needed to ascertain Offerors can meet the evaluation criteria.	RFP Changed. See revised Section L, M, SOO and Attch_0015 where "Key Personnel" Changed to "Key Personnel/Key Positions" and added clarifying language. No Resumes required. Revised L.4.2.1.5, Attch_0001 SOO para. 6.1 d) Personnel Management and the instructions for Attch_0015_ACWS_Staff_Level_Skills_Mix_Schedule_2016_04_04.xlsx. "Key Personnel/Key Positions" are Contractor identified.
1.051	ID/IQ SOO		1	16	6.1.d	Section 6.1.d states "Notify the Government if one or more of the key personnel (Contractor identified), for any reason, become or is expected to become unavailable for work for a continuous period exceeding 30 calendar days, or is expected to devote substantially less effort to the work than indicated in the approved IMS or as initially planned." Section L no longer contains a requirement for naming Key Personnel. Please clarify the SOO requirement.	Clarification of requirement.	RFP Change. Section L and Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO have been revised to clarify how Government is defining "Key Personnel/Key Positions" as "Contractor Identified" and the Position Descriptions in Attch_0015 define the labor categories for these positions.  In the Staff Levels Skill Mix Schedule (Attch_0015), Offerors are responsible for identifying key "positions" (no names, no resumes) and the qualifications that they propose for those positions. The qualifications for those Offeror-identified positions are what Government expects to be committed to the program, and fulfilled if the individual serving in that position needs to be replaced.  See revised Section L.4.2.1.5, Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO para. 6.1 d) Personnel Management and Attch_0015_ACWS_Staff_Level_Skills_Mix_Schedule_2016_04_04.xlsx.
1.061	L			15	4.2.1.5.1	Will high speed internet for non government computers be provided at the demonstration site?	As indicated in the SV-1, many systems must interface with ACWS. To demonstrate this ability would require internet access for demonstration servers/computers.	RFP Change. Yes. See new Attch_0026 (Technology Demonstration Logistics), included in the RFP amendment. The Government will provide commercial (residential grade) internet access in the conference room. Offerors will be able to connect laptops to the router with a provided Ethernet cable or, if preferred, use the commercial WI-FI connection that will also be available in the conference room.
1.071	CDRL A005					A005 references a "DoD Risk Management Guide for Defense Acquisition Programs." Is the June 2015 "Department of Defense Risk, Issue, and Opportunity Management Guide for Defense Acquisition Programs" the correct reference document for this CDRL?	"DoD Risk Management Guide for Defense Acquisition Programs" is an old DAU document (2006).	RFP Change. CDRL A005 revised. Yes, the DoD Risk, Issue, and Opportunity Management Guide, dated June 2015, listed in Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO Paragraph 9.0 Compliance References is the intended and correct reference. CDRL A005 has been revised to reflect the correct reference title.
1.081	CDRL A003 Integrated Master Schedule (IMS)		Attachme nt 0019 compare with CDRL A003			Attachment 0019 lists first submission for CDRL A003 as 90 days prior to SFR; however, the A003 CDRL form states first submission is delivered 90 days after contract award.  Will the Governrnt please clarify which is the correct due date.	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised Exhibit A, CDRL A003 and Attch_0019 changed to reflect that the first IMS submission is delivered 30 days prior to PDR.
1.091	Attachment 0016 Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan		Attachme nt 0016	13	5.7	Paragraph 5.7 references Tables 2 and 3, but no tables exist in this attachment.  Please clarify.	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0016 Quality Assurance Plan. Table 2, Surveillance Matrix: Performance Outcomes and Required Services, and Table 3, Surveillance Matrix: Processes/Products, have been added in Section 5.7.
1.101	Section H					Some bidders have had upfront access to information and interfaces for systems such as GFEBS, SPS and LMP.  A) Will the Government please clarify how the current incumbent contractors on these systems currently deal with OCI, as defined in this RFP?  B) Additionally, will the Government please provide technical documentation and specs for all system interfaces specific to ACWS, to include GFEBS and GEX, to ensure the most level competitive landscape and also provide offerors the ability to offer reduced schedule?  C) Or, will the Government please clarify how it intends to level the competitive landscape in terms of cost and schedule to account for this?	Clarification/OCI	No RFP Change. A) All Contractors are required to comply with the Solicitation Section A and H Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) instructions for Pre and Post Award. In accordance with the FAR, the Government will not provide any one Offeror with details of another OCI plan.  B) See Attch_0010 Interface Development Strategy. The ACWS Program Office has published this as the extent of information controlled by this office. Interface technical documentation and specifications are controlled by the Agency and Organization that are responsible for external systems. The specific technical requirements for any interface exchange are documented in a Memorandum of Agreement. After a contract is awarded, Interface Partners will provide details about their systems.  C) The Solicitation Sections L & M require full and open competition under FAR Part 15. The evaluation Factors defined in Section M represent the Governments approach to a fair competition in the evaluation for Cost and Schedule. The ACWS Source Selection Plan has been reviewed and approved as legally sufficient by the Competition Advocate and the Principle Assistant Responsible for Contracting, Army Contracting Command - Rock Island as well as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Procurement).

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
1.111	Attachment 0002 TO 0001 SOO		Attachment 0002			CDRL A013 states it is due 60 days after the last day of the 12th month. This puts this CDRL out of the POP of the Risk Reduction Phase.  Will the Government please clarify how offerors should reflect their work in the IMS?	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised Exhibit A, CDRL A013, and Attch_0019 (CDRL list) revised to reflect that the CDRL is due 10 business days before the end of each task order period of performance / date of final product acceptance, after 95% or more of total contract costs have been incurred.
1.121	CDRL A003 Integrated Master Schedule (IMS)					CDRL A003 IMS states first submission is 90 calendar days after contract award yet Block 10 states frequency is Bi-Weekly and subsequent submission is 30 days prior to PDR.  Will the Government please clarify the date for 1st submission of the IMS?	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised Exhibit A, CDRL A003 Integrated Master Schedule. To clarify the 1st submission of the IMS CDRL: The first IMS submission is due 30-days before PDR.
1.131	CDRL A003 Integrated Master Schedule (IMS)					A) CDRL A003, IMS CDRL states first submission is 90 calendar days after contract award yet Block 10 states frequency is Bi-Weekly and subsequent submission is 30 days prior to PDR.  B) Please clarify whether or not the Government expects a bi-weekly submission thereafter regardless of Block 13.	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised Exhibit A, CDRL A003 Integrated Master Schedule. A) Revised BLOCK 10 to read "AsReq", Revised BLOCK 12, Date of First Submission is due 30-days before PDR. BLOCK 13, Subsequent Submission, 30-days before CDR of each Build.  B) The Government expects compliance with the DD 1423.
1.141	Sec. L	N/A	0029	6 & 7, 17 and 18	L.3.1 & L.4.2.4.3	The proposal organization set forth for the Integrated Master Schedule indicated Level 3 tasks. Please confirm that offeror may propose tasks below Level 3?	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised Section L.3.1 Table Volume 1, Attachments, changed as follows: "(to a minimum of Level 3 tasks with a 1 April 2017 Contract Award) Compatible with MS Project 2013, No page Limit."
1.151	Sec. L	N/A	0029	6 & 7, 17 and 18	L.3.1 & L.4.2.4.3	The proposal organization set forth for the Integrated Master Schedule indicated (Level 3 tasks L.4.2.4.3) indicates that for Task Order 0001 all IMS activities at all anticipated levels are required. We recommend updating the proposal organization information to align with L.4.2.4.3.	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised Section L.3.1 Table Volume 1, Attachments, changed as follows: "(to a minimum of Level 3 tasks with a 1 April 2017 Contract Award) Compatible with MS Project 2013, No page Limit."
1.161	A.	Volume III		N/A	6	Please specify a PoP start date for the program.	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised Section L, L.4.2.4.2 changed as follows: "...For Government Planning purposes, the IMS shall reflect a 1 April 2017 Contract Award (ID/IQ and Task Order 0001)."
1.171	Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan -5.7		16	13	2	Would the government please provide Table 2 referenced in this paragraph?	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0016 Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan, Table 2, Surveillance Matrix: Performance Outcomes and Required Services, added to the QASP in Section 5.7.
1.181	Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan -5.7		16	13	3	Would the government please provide Table 3 referenced in this paragraph?	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0016 Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan, Table 3, Surveillance Matrix: Processes/Products, has been added to the QASP in Section 5.7.
1.191	SOO 6.0			11	3	Is the ATP decision based on the acceptance of documents provided during TMRR?		No RFP Change. None of the CDRLs are "Acquisition Milestone Documents" as defined in DODI 5000.02. The Government PdM has responsibility to produce the regulatory and statutory required documents. However, the acceptance of the CDRLs identified in Attch_0002 Task Order SOO and specifically those annotated with (**) as Success Criteria will inform the Government PdM in writing the required documents and briefing the Milestone Decision Authority in the ATP-2 (Milestone B) Decision.
1.201		3	2	4	1	Figure 2 indicates that Solution Deployment (CLIN 6) and Operations and Sustainment (CLIN 8) will not be funded. However, Task Order SOO 6.6 and SOO 6.8 both require plans to be developed during Risk Reduction. Please confirm if offerors should include these plans in the Risk Reduction phase and where to include the price.	The SOO calls for minimal work to be performed for Solutions Deployment and Operations & Support to develop Plans and deploy and maintain the OOTB solution.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0002 Task Order SOO Figure 2 that reflect the CLINs 6 & 8 are used for "Planning Only" to allow the CDRLs to be resourced.
1.211						Is the period of performance for TO 0001 fixed at 12 months or can offerors propose a shorter POP?	Clarification requested since the RFP prefers a schedule that provides LD, IOC, and FD capability earlier than the Notional Schedule.	No RFP Change. The Task Order 0001 Period of Performance is set at 12 Months. This permits a thorough execution of the Attch_0002 Task Order SOO Objectives and an orderly ramp up to the ATP-2 Decision.
1.221						Since resumes are not required by the RFP, where should offerors describe/identify their proposed key personnel?	Key personnel are still referenced in L.4.2.1.5 and SOO para 6.1. However, there is no specific instruction to include/identify them in the proposal.	RFP Change. See revised Section L and Attch_0001 Task Order SOO that better clarify how Government is defining "Key Personnel/Key Positions". Resumes are not required.  See revised Attch_0015 Staff Levels Skill Mix Schedule (Attch. 15), Offerors are responsible for identifying "Key Positions" (no names, no resumes) and the qualifications that they propose for those positions.  The qualifications for those Offeror-identified positions are what Government expects to be committed to the program, and fulfilled if the individual serving in that position needs to be replaced. Offerors are reminded to review L.4.2.1.5, Attch_0001 SOO para. 6.1 d) Personnel Management and Attch_0015_ACWS_Staff_Level_Skills_Mix_Schedule_2016_04_04.xlsx.
1.231			1	18	6.2e	In Amendment 0001, with the revision of language to allow the "ACWS Software Solution Operating in a Government Designated Hosting Facility and/or the Contractor's Facility" for the Risk Reduction Phase (TO-001), would the government consider allowing Contractor Facility-based hosting for ALL ACWS solution deployments for TO-002 and beyond, to include Production and COOP use?	Use of Contractor facility-based hosted environments may affect product selection, license types, license costs, etc. and offer overall savings to the ACWS program.	No RFP Change. See Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO, both revised for other questions, provide the Government's Objectives for Hosting at a Government Site.  To clarify, for the Solicitation, the Government is not considering use of a contractor facility to host production or COOP software.



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
1.241			1	10	6.3.2f	Pertaining the delivery of the PDR approved solution into the target development environment at the Government designated hosting facility no later than 12 months after contract award: would the government entertain the option of repurposing licenses already purchased and deployed for Risk Reduction blueprinting (or the contingency licenses also deployed during TO-001), the implication being that following PDR one or both of the aforementioned environments would be decommissioned in order to reuse said licenses?	Reuse of licenses lowers overall ACWS costs, especially since RR environments do not have stated purpose post Risk Reduction phase.	No RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 Software Disclosure, changed in response to other questions. The Offeror should propose the most cost-effective solution possible for Licensing.
1.251	ACWS SOO		0001	12		"Milestone Decisions (MS) are redesignated as Authorization to Proceed (ATP) decision points and the required documentation will be tailored at each point." Can the Government make available the tailored list of documentation required for each ATP DP?		No RFP Change. No additional information will be released before contract award. For ATP-2, see DoDI 5000.02, Table 2 - Milestone and Phase Information Requirements, for a Milestone B decision.
2.001	L		29	4	L.1.2.4	It is the prime bidders' responsibility for responding to all post submission requests. Please confirm that subcontractors will not receive ENs directly from the Army.	ASSIST	No RFP Change. The Government will not send Evaluation Notices (ENs) directly to any Subcontractor, unless the Prime directs that communication. As stated in L.1.2.4, it remains of PRIME Contractors responsibility to establish accounts for their SUBCONTRACTORS to respond to Government ENs.
2.002	L.4.4.2	III	20, 21	P21 and 22	N/A	The support Tabs require input based on the fact they are shaded blue. Will the Government be providing a revised workbook?	Disconnect between Government provided number for ODC and Travel	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0020 and Attch_0021 that now allow for pricing of CLINS 0006 and 0008.
2.003	L (a)	III	RFP	61	(a)	Respectfully request that FAR 52.215-20, Alternate I be changed to FAR 52.215-20, Alternate IV The rationale:  1. The implementing FAR clause, 15.408(l), follows the hierarchy at FAR 15.402 2. Under 15.402, the Government "shall purchase supplies and services at fair and reasonable prices." To established reasonableness, the contracting officer shall obtain a certificate unless an exception applies 3. Under the exceptions listed in FAR 15.403-1(b), the first is adequate price competition 4. According to the standards for adequate price competition established under 15.403-1(c), there is a reasonable expectation that this solicitation will have two or more responsible offerors providing independent prices  With an exception reasonably established for the proposal, the implementing clause, FAR 15.408(l) indicates that FAR 52.215-20 be included in the solicitation using Alternate IV (see 15.408(l)(4))	FAR Clause	RFP Change. See revised Section I, the Government changed from Alt I to Alt IV.
2.004	Solicitation - 4. NOTICE OF PRE-AWARD OCIs	5	N/A	18-19	4(b) and 4(c)	The government states that individuals and their POC information from the support contractors are listed. However, only the support contractor name and address are provided. Would the government please provide the individual names, email addresses, and phone numbers for each of the listed support contractors?	OCI / Support contractor NDAs are required to be included in the contract volume.	RFP Amendment 0002. See Section A and I of Amendment 0002. Each listed company now has a POC Name, e-mail and phone. The FAR 9.505-4 requirement is met with an agreement with the firms cited.
2.005	Solicitation - 5. NOTICE OF POST-AWARD OCIs	5	N/A	19	Missing 5(d)	5(a) states the following: "(a) The Government will, in appropriate circumstances, release to the ACWS contractor, its subcontractors, and its individual employees, nonpublic information in the performance of this contract, subject to the protections referenced at paragraph (d) of this instruction." However, no paragraph (d) is found. Would the government please provide paragraph (d)?	OCI / Clarification required to develop OCI Mitigation Plan.	RFP Amendment 0002. See revised Section A, Para 4 OCI. The statement "...referenced at paragraph (d) of this instruction." was an error. The amendment 0002 removed that portion of the statement.
2.006	9. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS	5	N/A	21	9(b)(2)	9(b)(2) states: "(2) Describe any relevant limitations on future contracting, the term of which has not yet expired, to which the offeror or potential subcontractor agreed." Would the government please clarify this instruction?	OCI / Required for OCI Mitigation Plan	No RFP Change. To clarify 9(b)(2), Describe any contract that the contractor is currently performing as either the prime or the subcontractor, where the Period of Performance is still ongoing, that may have a potential OCI.
2.007	9. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS	5	N/A	21	9(c)	9(c) states: "Representation. The offeror represents, by submission of its offer, that to the best of its knowledge and belief it has disclosed all relevant information regarding any other organizational conflicts of interest as required in paragraph (c)(2) of this instruction." However, there is no paragraph (c)(2). Would the government please provide paragraph (c)(2)?	OCI / Required for OCI Mitigation Plan	RFP Change. See revised Section H, Para 9(c) OCI. The statement "...as required in paragraph (C)(2) of this instruction." was an error the amendment removed that portion of the statement.
2.008	L.4 INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF PROPOSAL CONTENT	5	N/A	27	1 L.4.6.2 Contract Information	The government states "Offerors shall complete all "fill-in" data." Please confirm that offerors are required to return only those sections requiring fill-in data versus resubmitting all of sections A-K.	Query submitted in order to clarify the government's request and potentially save the submission of superfluous information.	RFP Change, L.4.6.2 Contract Information, Revised to read: "Offerors shall complete and submit a complete solicitation (e.g. Standard Form 33 and Sections A-K) to include responses to all "fill-in" data herein."
2.009	Amendment 001 - Solicitation H, 4, b.	V	Amendment 1	p. 3	4(b)	Amendment 1 made the following change under 4(C) "The listed contractors in Section H has been changed from "expressly prohibited" to "may be prohibited". See Section H for the change." Will the government please change this language back to "expressly prohibited"?	OCI / Patent OCI	No RFP Change. Amendment 0003 provided the last update to the OCI instructions.

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
2.010	LM		0029_LM	14	L.4.2.1.4 (e)	Is it the Army's intent to "competitively procure" associated software license(s) outside of, or separate from, this solicitation?	It is unclear as to Army's intent, as there is CLIN 0009 "Licenses (for Commercial Software), included in award of this solicitation, however, the below section mentions an intent to "competitively procure." Section States: Describe a Software License Approach to meet the requirements of the Army Contracting Enterprise and the objectives of the SOO and the RFP. The approach should provide the Government the ability to operate and maintain the proposed software and software solution, and competitively procure it.	RFP Change. No, the Government does not have an objective or a requirement to transition the maintenance of the software code from the Contractor to the Government in either Attch_0001 Task Order SOO and Attch_0002 ID/IQ SOO.  See revised Section L. Paragraph L.4.2.1.4 (e) The approach should provide the Government the ability to operate <u>the software</u> , maintain the proposed software <u>licenses</u> , <u>the software solution configuration</u> , and after the Ordering Period ends, to competitively procure the ACWS Solution.  See revised Section M. Paragraph M.3.2.1.4. Solution Deployment sub-para e. "A License approach that provides the Government the ability to operate the software, <u>maintain the proposed software licenses</u> , <u>the software solution configuration</u> , and after the Ordering Period ends, to competitively procure the ACWS Solution is preferred.
2.011	LM - SubFactor 2: Management Capabilities		0029_LM	16	L.4.2.2	Would the Government consider requiring key personnel resumes as part of Sub Factor 2 Management Capabilities?	Given the ACWS program size and complexity, highly experienced key personnel are essential to the success (or risk) of the program.	RFP Change. No Resumes required. See revised Section L, M, SOO and Attch_0015 where "Key Personnel" Change to "Key Personnel/Key Positions" and added clarifying language. Revised L.4.2.1.5, Attch_0001 SOO para. 6.1 d) Personnel Management and the instructions for Attch_0015_ACWS_Staff_Level_Skills_Mix_Schedule_2016_04_04.xlsx. "Key Personnel/Key Positions" are Contractor identified.
2.012	A & L		29	Page 6 of Section A and page 2 of Section L	Section A 16 and L.1.2.1	Section A requires proposal submission by noon CDT on 31 May. Section L.1.2 further requires submission of the hardcopy version of Vol III to arrive by the proposal submission deadline. May 30th is a Federal holiday. With the holiday weekend and the short window of receipt on Tuesday morning, Offeror's must mail the hardcopy of Vol III by 26 May to assure delivery of the hardcopy before the deadline. Would the government consider allowing the hardcopy delivery to be postmarked by the submission delivery date and time?	Reduce risk of late delivery due to government holiday and potential flight delays due to weather with typical spring time weather conditions.	RFP Change. The RFP submission date is extended to 15-Jun-2016
2.013	L.4	III	0020 & 0021	21 & 22	L.4.4.2	The RFP specifies that a detailed cost proposal shall be provided for CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0006. It also requires a separate cost proposal for each Build under CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0006, and a separate cost proposal for each proposed Support under CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0006. Please clarify that the requirement for "separate cost proposals" can be satisfied by submitting a workbook with a separate sheet for each Build and each Support period, for each of these three CLINs. If this is not correct, please define what the Government means by "separate cost proposal".	Clarification of submittal instructions	No RFP Change. Offerors may submit a MicroSoft Excel Workbook with a separate Tab/Sheet for each Build and each Support period, for each of these three CLINs, as long as the Cost Proposal is submitted in accordance with Attch_0029 L.4.4.3 FAR Table 15-2.
2.014	L.4	III	0020 & 0021	21 & 22	L.4.4.2	The RFP specifies that a detailed cost proposal shall be provided for CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0006. It also requires a separate cost proposal for each proposed Support under CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0006. However, Attachments 0020 and 0021 indicate that no Support is to be proposed under CLIN 0004. Please clarify the instructions for proposing Support under CLIN 0004.	Clarification of submittal instructions	No RFP Change. The Government anticipates no proposed cost for CLIN 0004 under the Support Tab.
2.015	L.4.3.1.5	II	29	19	L.4.3.1.5	The FAR and other Federal regulations do not require contractors to track performance problems related to deliverables or services. Since this data is not tracked by contractors, is it acceptable to use the Government CPARS records and identified relevant contracts with marginal or unsatisfactory performance ratings in the Final CPAR to meet this requirement?	Clarification of requirement.	No RFP Change. Contractor performance may be submitted using CPARs from the PPIRS database at the Offeror's discretion. However, recent and relevant negative performance shall be submitted IAW L.4.3.1.5
2.016	L		29	1 and 2	A.3.A, L.1.1 and L.2.1	Sections A.3.A, L.1.1 and L.2.1 conflict in the number of days for which the proposal must be valid. Please clarify.	Clarification of requirement	RFP Change. See revised Solicitation File and SF 33. See Section A. paragraphs A.3.A - ID/IQ proposal must be valid for at least 365 days. A.3.B Offerors who wish to be considered for this additional selection must: a. Record 730 calendar days in block 12 of the SF 33 (365 days for Source Selection plus 365 for the period of performance of TO 0001). The Government will consider Attachment 0020 valid until the date of award of the ID/IQ. b. Submit Attachment 0021 with pricing for a period of performance beginning twelve months after the TO 0001 Period of Performance has begun. The non-price volumes and Attachment 0021 will be considered valid 365 days from the date of award of the ID/IQ.  See revised L.1.1 and L.1.2.1.
2.017	I			25	I-120	DFARS 252.227-7022 is applicable to A/E contracts related to construction. Since this clause is not applicable for this procurement, will the Government delete DFAR 252.227-7022? clause.	DFAR Clause	RFP Change. See revised Section I Clause list. I-120 DFARS 252.227-7022 was removed.
2.018	I			24	I-103	The solicitation includes , <b>DFAR 252.204-7015</b> regarding litigation support contractors. This clause is applicable to Commercial Items contract for litigation support services. We do not see any requirement in the PWS to provide litigation support services. Please identify the litigation support that Offeror's will be required to support. If it is not requirement, will the Government delete the clause?	DFAR Clause	RFP Change. See revised Section I Clause list. I-103 DFARS 252.204-7015 was removed.



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
2.019	B			7	4	The Government states that the incentives for CPIF CLINs will be mutually negotiated. However, the last sentence in this paragraph states the Government may unilaterally include any or all incentives. Will the incentives be negotiated between the parties and when will this occur?	CPIF	No RFP Change. Yes, the incentives will be negotiated between the parties and this negotiation will occur after contract award.
2.020	H			21	H.9(e)	Pursuant to the requirements of H.9(e), Offeror's need to submit NDAs with the support contractors identified in H.4.(b). Please provide contact information to include name, email address and phone number for the points of contracts of the six support contractors	NDAs	No RFP Change. See Amendment 0002 to the RFP.
2.021	L&M		29		L.4.4.7	If DCMA/DCAA has provide approval of Offeror's indirect rates for billing and bidding purposes, does the offeror need to provide the detail request in L.4.4.6.2, L.4.4.7 L.4.4.8, L.4.4.9?	Cost & Price Info	No RFP Change. Yes, the offeror needs to provide the detail request in L.4.4.6.2, L.4.4.7, L.4.4.8, L.4.4.9, even if DCMA/DCAA has provided approval of Offeror's indirect rates for billing and bidding purposes.
2.022	L&M		29 & 24			Does Attachment 0024 Column G fulfill the assertion requirements <b>DFAR 252.227-7017</b> or do offerors need to also provide a separate file with the Assertion of Rights iaw DFAR 252-227-7017? If the later, what volume is the Assertion of Rights to be included in?	DFAR Clause	No RFP Change. Yes, the Government intends that Attch_0024 fulfills the assertion requirements. However it remains the Offeror responsibility to assure that the Attch_0024 fulfills the assertion requirements DFAR 252.227-7017 for their proposed ACWS Solution.
2.023	I			23 -52		The RFP did not include invoicing provisions for the fixed price CLINs. Is it correct the contractors may invoice monthly under the fixed price CLINs?	INVOICING	No RFP Change. Invoicing provisions will be detailed at the CLIN level when the contract is awarded.
2.024	L			11	L.3.3.2	Would the government consider allowing font size 8 on graphics?	Supports development of large, complex graphics.needed to convey the CWS solution.	Draft Response: No RFP Change. The Government will not allow font size 8 on graphics or in text. See "L.3.3.2 Tables, Charts, Graphs, and Figures. For tables, charts, graphs and figures, the text shall be no smaller than 10 point font size."
2.025	H				8	Is it correct to interpret <b>section H paragraph 8</b> that for the ACWS awardee, and subcontracted teammates, ALL Army contracts these companies may desire to pursue, either individually or as teammates, during the 10 year ACWS contract period of performance will require for each contract an OCI mitigation plan whose acceptance is subject to Army contracting officer's adjudication, and for which acceptable mitigation criteria has not been specified by Army?	Clarification/OCI	No RFP Change. Yes, Section H, paragraph "8. LIMITATION ON FUTURE CONTRACTING (a) Limitation. The Contractor and any of its affiliates, shall be ineligible to perform as a prime, subcontractor, joint venture, or team member for any other Army requirement for a period of time from contract award through final task order completion unless a Government-approved mitigation plan exists." -- this covers the entire planned 10 year Ordering Period and any Period of Performance on Task Order(s) that may extend past that timeline.
2.026	H				8(b)	Will the prime contractor be required to submit subcontracts prior to their release to the government for a <b>conflict of interest (COI)</b> adjudication? The purpose is to determine whether the subcontract includes task(s) which results in an organizational COI. This would result in the subcontractor being ineligible to perform as a prime, subcontractor, joint venture, or team member for any other Army requirement for a period of time from contract award through final task order completion unless a Government-approved mitigation plan exists.	Clarification	No RFP Change. Yes, Submission of Subcontracting Plan is required prior to release of Government Conflict Of Interest adjudication.
2.027	H & L				H.8 // L.4.6.3	Paragraph 8 states subcontractors for whom the prime contractor determines a conflict of interest exists will be limited in its future opportunities to only those instances where the government approves its OCI plan. Given this requirement request advise if proposal OCI plan requirements contained in paragraph L.4.6.3 should be expanded to include OCI plans from both the prime and all subcontracted teammates.	Clarification/OCI	RFP Change. L.4.6.3 changed to state, "The Offeror and any subcontractor who furnishes advice, information, direction, or assistance to an offeror or any other contractor in support of the preparation or submission of an offer for a Government contract by that offeror..."
2.028	A			5 of 64	12.c(ii)	Will Army provide, and/or increase scope of program to develop, service virtualization services for all interfaces that could result in the ACWS contractor and subcontracted teammates, having unequal access to non-public information?	Service Virtualization Services in addition to preventing OCI during risk mitigation and construction phases will facilitate automatic and continuous testing throughout the development period and provide means to replicate issues identified during operations and sustainment without impacting the operational system	No RFP Change. The Solicitation represents the Government's requirements. The Government does not anticipate any changes in Scope. The proposal and any proposed solution must be compliant with the OCI instructions, please refer to Section A Paragraph 12.1 and 12.2 , along with Section H Paragraph 5.
2.029	A			5 of 64	12.1	Will the Army remove the post-award OCI re-evaluation language?	Once the OCI mitigation plan has been approved and accepted under this solicitation, that OCI mitigation plan should be valid throughout the life of the contract; therefore, there would not be a need to re-evaluate unless the Statement of Work materially changes.	No RFP Change. The Government will not remove Post-Award OCI re-evaluation language.
2.030	Attachment 0029 Sections L.1.1 and L.1.2.1		Attachme nt 0029	1 and 2	1 and 2	The Government states in section L.1.1 that "All offerors must allow their proposals to be valid for at least 365 days." The Government also states in section L.1.2.1 that the "Offeror agrees to hold firm the prices in its offer for 180 calendar days from the date specified for receipt of offers."  Can the Government confirm that the offeror's price is not expected to be valid after 180 days?	Clarification	RFP Change. The 180 days was and error. See revised L.1.1 and L.1.2.1, for valid for 365 days or 730 days.

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
2.031	Attachment 0029 Section L.4.4.2		Attachment 0029	22	1	<p>The Government states in section L.4.4.2 "In response to the solicitation, the Offeror shall provide a detailed cost proposal for each of the cost CLINs (0003, 0004, and 0006) with the exception of CLINs 0012 and 0013 which will have surrogate (Government provided number) amounts. Each proposed Build identified on tab "Individual Builds" in Attachment 0020, Price Matrix, under CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0006 requires a separate cost proposal. Each proposed Support identified on Tab Support under CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0006 requires a separate cost proposal."</p> <p>Can the Government confirm that for CLINS 0003, 0004 and 0006 the individual 15-2's are not to be built in separate excel files than Attachment 0020 or 0021 and that it only wants the files listed in Section 3.1 Proposal Organization under Volume III Cost/Price?</p>	Clarification	No RFP Change. Yes, Offerors may submit an MS Excel workbook with a separate sheet for each Build and each Support period, for each of these three CLINs, as long as the cost proposal is in accordance with Attch_0029 L.4.4.3 FAR Table 15-2.
2.032	Attachment 0029 Section L.4.4.2		Attachment 0029	22	1	<p>The Government states in section L.4.4.2 "In response to the solicitation, the Offeror shall provide a detailed cost proposal for each of the cost CLINs (0003, 0004, and 0006) with the exception of CLINs 0012 and 0013 which will have surrogate (Government provided number) amounts. Each proposed Build identified on tab "Individual Builds" in Attachment 0020, Price Matrix, under CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0006 requires a separate cost proposal. Each proposed Support identified on Tab Support under CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0006 requires a separate cost proposal."</p> <p>Per the request for Separate Cost Proposals for CLINs 0003, 0004 and 0006, would the Government accept a single file for each of the Support CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0006 with a single tab for each year of Support?</p>	A separate file per per CLIN per year of Support would lead to a substantial number of files when they could be combined for ease of review	No RFP Change. Yes Offerors may submit a workbook with a separate sheet for each Build and each Support period, for each of these three CLINs, as long as the cost proposal is in accordance with Attch_0029 L.4.4.3 FAR Table 15-2.
2.033	Attachment 0029 Section L.4.4.1.1		Attachment 0029	28	1	<p>The Government states in section L.4.4.11 "Failure in the submission of all required supporting documentation for the Offeror and/or its proposed Subcontractors may render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal may not be further evaluated and may not be considered for award."</p> <p>Can the Government confirm that subcontractors are not required to submit sealed bids if they are bid as T&amp;M to the prime contractor on CLINS 0003, 0004 or 0006?</p>	To determine if only CPFF Subcontractors are to provide supporting documentation directly to the Government	No RFP Change. The Government confirms we do not require Subcontractors to submit sealed bids if they are bid as T&M to the prime contractor on CLINS 0003, 0004 or 0006. However, the Prime contractor remains responsible for a detailed Cost Proposal for CLINS 0003, 0004 or 0006. This may require the Subcontractor to submit directly to the Government and this process is detailed in the ASSIST Instruction L.1.2.4
2.034	Attachment 0020 and 0021 Cost/Price Matrix	Volume III	Attachment 0020 and Attachment 0021	N/A	N/A	<p>CLINs 0005 and 0006 are flipped in the individual build and support tabs in Attachment 20 and 21.</p> <p>Will the Government provide updated CLIN tables that match the Price Evaluation Summary?</p>	Clarification	RFP Change. Attch_0020 and Attch_0021 spreadsheet have been corrected.
2.035	Attachment 0020 and 0021 Cost/Price Matrix	Volume III	Attachment 0020 and Attachment 0021, SOO Section 6.11	N/A	N/A	<p>Within the Task Order 0001 SOO, there is a clear objective that CLIN 0011 should be "activated" for the objectives specified in SOO Task Order 0001 Section 6.11. However, on Page 4 the CLIN graphic shows it is not available for Task Order 0001 Risk Reduction.</p> <p>Should CLIN 0011 be activated for Task Order 0001 in Attachments 20 and 21?</p>	Clarification	RFP Change. RFP Attch_0002, Figure 2 correctly shows CLIN 11 as active. Attch_0020 and Attch_0021 spreadsheet have been corrected.
2.036	Section H					Can the Government provide POCs for the support contractors listed in Section H?	OCI/ Clarification, since NDAs must be executed prior to submission	No RFP Change. See Amendment 0003 to the RFP.
2.037	Attachment 0029 Section L.4.5.4.1 c. and d.		Attachment 0029			Pursuant to I-168: FAR 52.219-9, the offeror, upon request by the Contracting Officer, shall submit and negotiate a subcontracting plan... Are offerors required to submit a subcontracting plan with their proposal submission?	Clarification	RFP Change. Yes, A Subcontracting Plan is required as part of proposal submission. See revised Section L.3.1. and L.4.5.4
2.038	Sec. H	N/A	N/A		H.4.(c)	RFP Section H.4.(c) requires the offeror to execute and submit, as part of its proposal, proprietary information agreements with six (6) individual organizations. Will the Government provide the names and contact information for the cognizant individual with each organization responsible for these agreements.	OCI/Clarification	No RFP Change. See Amendment 0003 to the RFP.
2.039	H	N/A	N/A	19, 20, 21	H.5(a), H.6(b)(5, 6), (h), H.7(b)(1), H.9(c, e)	<p>Section H includes several inaccurate or confusing internal references. Please clarify the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Section H.5 (a), there is a reference to "paragraph (d) of this instruction", however, there is no paragraph (d).</li> <li>• In Section H.6 (b)(5), there is a reference to subsection "(b)(2) (i) through (iv) of this clause", however, there are no subsections (i) through (iv).</li> <li>• In Section H.6 (b)(6), there is a reference to "any violation of the requirements of (i) through (vi) of this paragraph", however there are no subsections (i) through (vi).</li> <li>• In Section H.6 (h), there is reference to "this paragraph (f)". Should this reference be to "paragraph (h)?"</li> <li>• In Section H.7 (b)(1), there is a reference to "paragraph (c) (2) of this clause", however there is no paragraph (c) (2). Should this reference be to paragraph (b)(2)?</li> <li>• In Section H.9 (c), there is a reference to "as required in paragraph (c) (2) of this instruction", however there is not paragraph (c) (2). Should the reference be to paragraph (b)(2)?</li> <li>• In Section H.9 (e) (Page 21), there is a reference to "the agreement referenced in 4. (b).". Should this be a reference to Section H.4 (c)?</li> </ul>	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised Section H. All inaccuracies have been corrected.



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
2.040		Volume III	0017	N/A	Contract Participation Matrix	On the sheet labeled "Contract Participation Matrix," Line 41 says: "Note: This figure shall equal cell A9 in Cost Price Matrix." Attachment 0005 Cost/Price Matrix does not exist in the RFP. Please update the file name and cell reference for this new RFP.	Clarification	RFP Change. Spreadsheet has been corrected. See revised Attch_0017
2.041		Volume III	0020 & 0021	N/A	N/A	Does the government require separate sealed packages for Attachment 21?	Clarification	No RFP Change. The offeror may submit one sealed package for Attch_0020 and 0021.
2.042	I-168(c)		Solicitation	40	(c)	"(c) The offeror, <u>upon request by the Contracting Officer</u> , shall submit and negotiate a subcontracting plan, where applicable, that separately addresses subcontracting with small business, veteran-owned small business, service-disabled veteran-owned small business, HUBZone small business concerns, small disadvantaged business, and women-owned small business concerns. If the offeror is submitting an individual contract plan, the plan must separately address subcontracting with small business, veteran-owned small business, service-disabled veteran-owned small business, HUBZone small business, small disadvantaged business, and women-owned small business concerns, with a separate part for the basic contract and separate parts for each option (if any). The plan shall be included in and made a part of the resultant contract. The subcontracting plan shall be negotiated within the time specified by the Contracting Officer. <u>Failure to submit and negotiate the subcontracting plan shall make the offeror ineligible for award of a contract.</u> " Can the Government confirm whether or not a Small Business Subcontracting Plan is required in Volume IV of the proposal response?	Section L and RFP Section I are unclear with respect to submittal of a Small Business Subcontracting Plan.	RFP Change. Yes, Submission of Subcontracting Plan is required prior to release of Government Conflict Of Interest adjudication. See revised Section L.3.1. and L.4.5.4.
2.043	Section L	L.1.2.4	29	3 & 4	N/A	Please confirm that contractors should add subcontractors to the Assist tool after Government sets up Contractors account in the ASSIST and ASSIST2 Tool.	Need instructions for adding team members/subcontractors to ASSIST and ASSIST 2 Tools.	No RFP Change. The Government will not send Evaluation Notices (ENs) directly to any Subcontractor, unless the Prime directs that communication. As stated in L.1.2.4, it remains of PRIME Contractors responsibility to establish accounts for their SUBCONTRACTORS to respond to Government ENs.
2.044	SOO 6.1 (i)	Vol I	1	17	6.1 (i)	Please confirm that EVM is not a requirement at this time	SOO paragraph says EVM waiver was granted	RFP Change. EVM is not applicable for this Solicitation. See revised Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO and Exhibit A for the removal of the Task and CDRLs Risk Reduction Task Order.
2.045	I-163	V	00 W52P1J1 6R0058_4 .4.16	35	I-163	Please identify the contract reference where the Aircraft Public and Passenger Liability and Vessel Collision is applicable to this effort.	These insurance liability coverages do not seem to be applicable	No RFP Change. Required per FAR 28.307-2 for contract where employees will be traveling by air.
2.046	L-20	V	00 W52P1J1 6R0058_4 .4.16	63	1	Would the government please update the date for L-20 252.204-7008 from October 2015 to December 2015?	On December 30, 2015, the DoD issued a second interim rule that updated this clause to provide a grace period for implementation of the NIST 800-171 security requirements. Per, The Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy (DPAP) website, the DFARS interim rule 2013-D018, effective December 30, 2015 supersedes the rule on 8 October 2015."	RFP Change, The Government has updated clause.
2.047	License Template		24	9	5.4	This provision states that the Government will get title to Derivative Works created from the COTS software. Please clarify.	This term appears to conflict with the DFARS clauses listed on page 25 of 64 of the RFP in which the Government receives rights, not ownership, to Derivative Works.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 instructions and revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template.
2.048	L			12	L.4.2	Please confirm that the Introductory Overview for Volume I is not included in the Volume I page count. Volume II has 2 extra pages allocated to the introduction.	Clarification of page count	RFP Change. See revised reference L.3.1. Proposal Organization, the response for Volume I, Technical/Risk: "Factor - 1 Technical/Risk introductory overview and Subfactor 1 Technical Capabilities:" "Limit of 35 Pages", Thus, the introduction is included in the first section of Vol I and it is included in the "Overall Page Limit for the Entire Technical/Risk Volume" and specially, "Overall 50 pages, divided as noted by Subfactor 1 & 2."
2.049						Will the government use the new Department of Defense Source Selection Procedures (SSP) released by OUSD on April 1, 2016 or continue with the procedures issued on March 4, 2011?	To determine the technique the government will use for best value tradeoffs.	No Change. IAW with the DPAP implementing policy, ACWS Source Selection Plan was already approved and it follows the AFARS - Appendix AA, Army Source Selection Supplement (AS3) to the Department of Defense Source Procedures, dated December 21, 2012.

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
2.050	H				8	Reference is made to the provision in Section H, paragraph 8, Limitation on Future Contracting. Since contractor personnel supporting the development, implementation and maintenance of the Army Contract Writing System (ACWS) are not involved in developing contract requirements, writing solicitations or evaluating proposals, the only potential organizational conflict of interest (OCI) that we believe could arise from performance on the ACWS contract is an unequal access to nonpublic information OCI and not an impaired objectivity or biased ground rules OCI. Would the Army please confirm this assessment and/or provide additional information on its OCI concerns relative to performance on the ACWS contract? If confirmed, would the Army accept an OCI mitigation approach relying solely on the use of individual non-disclosure agreements to be executed by all personnel directly supporting the ACWS contract that have access to actual Army contract data as an effective and compliant mitigation approach? If so, since the RFP's OCI section already has a clause that requires such non-disclosure agreements, would the Army remove the Limitation on Future Contracting clause, in order to eliminate any risk on ACWS offerors that winning ACWS could prohibit them from competing for future Army requirements/contracts or continuing to perform on existing Army contracts?	OCI / Request to remove the Limitation on Future Contracting clause in RFP	No RFP Change. The Government is not foreclosing the possibility of OCIs of any nature. The contractor has the ability to compete on future procurements only when an OCI Mitigation Plan is approved by the Contracting Officer.
2.051	M			29	M.1.3	With respect to the Government's strategy to replace the original ACWS contract awardee with another contractor before the end of the Risk Reduction base year, should offerors who decide they want to be considered for selection as the "additional contractor" assume in their pricing that they would have to include a full, new, risk reduction phase, to include SFR/SRR, PDR, etc.? Should they also assume that the period of performance of the contract the Government awards to them will also consist of a 1-year base, a 4-year option period, and a 5-year option period?		No RFP Change. A) Yes, Offerors submitting Attch_0021 must include a full, new, risk reduction phase, to include SFR/SRR, PDR. B) Yes, Offerors submitting Attch_0021 must include the Ordering Periods (not period of performance) of a 1-year base, a 4-year option period, and a 5-year option period.
2.052	I – Contract Clauses	RFP		25 of 64	Clause I-120 Unlimited Rights	Please explain the applicability of DFARS 252.227-7022 to this procurement for COTS software. The description for this clause states that it is to be used in A/E contracts related to construction efforts.		RFP Change. Clause was removed.
2.053	H		RFP, Amend 1	5 of 7	H.8	What is the process to submit OCI plans regarding competition for other Army contracts during contract execution?	OCI	No RFP Change. Submit all OCI Mitigation Plans, relevant to Section H to the ACWS Contracting Officer for approval.
2.054	H		RFP, Amend 1	5 of 7	H.8	Does the prohibition described in H.8.a apply to pre-existing awards where the successful Offeror is already performing? If yes, please provide details on how stopping performance/work on other contracts will be handled without triggering a breach of contract.	OCI	No RFP Change. Follow guidelines in H.7. for pre-existing awards.
2.055	A0002		RFP, Amend 1	2 of 7	2	Will the Government consider changing the due date to 1 or 2 June?	The Memorial Day federal holiday with Government office closures needlessly complicates the logistics of using a commercial carrier to deliver the hard copy of Volume III.	RFP Change. The RFP submission date is extended to 15-Jun-2016
2.056	L		29	2	L.1.2	Please confirm that proposals can be hand delivered.	Proposal Delivery	No RFP Change. Response - No. IAW L.1.2., Cost/Price must be sent via registered post or carrier.
2.057	L.4.4.2	III	20&21	P21 and 22	N/A	Is it the government's intention that Risk Reduction cost is not proposed for CLIN 0011, Studies and Analysis, as the cost cell for this requirement on the Price Evaluation Summary tab is locked/restricted?	Risk Reduction cost could be proposed for Studies and Analysis per the SOO	RFP Change. Attch_0020 and 0021 revised to allow cost to be proposed for CLIN 0011
2.058	L.4.4.2	III	20&21	P21 and 22	N/A	Is it the government's intention for Transition Out to be priced separately for Program management (CLIN 0001) and Systems Engineering Management & Planning (CLIN 0002)? The Transition Out cells for CLINs 0001 and 0002 are shaded blue and open for possible input.	Transition Out requirement is captured under CLIN 0010	No RFP Change. Clarification response - Yes, See Attch_0001, "** Figure 4 Notes: a) CLINS for Program Management (PGM Mgt.) and Systems Engineering Management & Planning (SE Mgt & Planning) are projected to be included in each TO." See SOO paragraphs 6.1, 6.2 and 6.11 with CDRLs to understand the scope objectives. Offerors must submit the revised Attch_0020 and _21 as requested.
2.059	L.4.4.2	III	20&21	P21 and 22	N/A	There appears to be a disconnect between the CLIN for Training (CLIN 0005) and Solution Deployment (CLIN 0006) on the Price Evaluation Summary, Individual Builds, and Support tabs. This disconnect also leads to possible Support cost not being proposed for Training (CLIN 0005) on the Price Evaluation Summary tab as the cost cell for this requirement is locked/restricted.	CLIN disconnect for Training and Solution Deployment will lead to incorrect cost allocation	RFP Change. Attch_0020 & 0021 are revised and all cells required for submission are open for Offerors to propose. See revised Attch_0001 SOO Figure 4 and paragraphs 6.5 - 6.8 to understand these tasks.
2.060	L.4 INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF PROPOSAL CONTENT	5	25		L.4.6.9 ACWS Cost and Software Data Reporting (CSDR) Plan (Attachment 0025)28	Please confirm that Attachment 0025 should be submitted as a separate document. Please provide the filename for this attachment.	Query submitted in order to clarify the government's request	RFP Change. Attch_0025_ACWS_Cost_and_SW_Data_Rptg_Plan_2016_04_04 is a separate document that shall be submitted with Volume V, Contract Documentation. See revised Section L.3.1 that has been modified to move Attch_0025 from Volume III to Volume V. See file name in L.3.1
2.061	L&M		29	16	L.4.2.2.2 Program Management	The introductory paragraph states, 'This summary shall describe the Program Management approach to Cost, Schedule, Personnel, etc.' Should it read, 'approach to Cost, Schedule, Performance, etc?'	Subfactor 2	No RFP Change. The RFP is clear. Offerors are reminded to read the entire solicitation and the context of the instruction.
2.062	B			10	CLIN 0011	For CLIN 0011, Studies, Analysis, Assessments and Improvements, not all requirements are fully detailed - as such, respectfully recommend that this Firm Fixed Price CLIN be changed to a Cost-Plus contract type.	Studies, Analysis, Assessment	No RFP Change. Please submit as FFP. Tasks proposed under SOO Paragraph 6.11 will be evaluated as part of entire PWS and Attch_0015 under Factor 1 - Technical/Risk.



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
2.063	M		29	28	M.1.2	Please confirm that the requirement for "1000 federal government users" means licensed users of a CWS application not licenses that are part of a larger enterprise solution.	Gate Criteria	No RFP Change. Response to Clarification: Yes, 1,000 users of a COT-CWS Application. See Attch_0028, TAB: INSTRUCTIONS for Excel Columns A - I. Each proposed Software Product Name is listed separately.  See Section M.1.2 GATE Criteria, last paragraph, "Offeror Software Solution (Attachment 0028)–the primary proposed Commercial Off The Shelf Contract Writing Solution (COTS-CWS) software application(s), or product(s), ... [Excerpt]...a deployment to at least 1,000 Federal Government users whose installed copy is not separated by more than two (2) versions."
2.064	L.3	V	29	9	L.3.1	The Proposal Organization table indicates the RFP Compliance Matrix should be submitted in Volume V, however, this conflicts with the Volume I instructions, Section L.4.2.4.1 on page 17 which indicates this attachment is in Volume I. Please clarify the submittal instructions inconsistency.	Clarification of submittal instructions	RFP Change. See revised Section L.3.1. Submit Compliance Matrix with Vol V. Section L, para L.4.2.4 revised to remove Compliance Matrix. Title and the text of L.4.2.4.1 was moved to be placed at "L.4.6.12 Compliance Matrix".
2.065	L.3	III and V	25	8	L.3.1	The Proposal Organization table indicates the ACWS Cost and Software Data Reporting Plan, (Attachment 0025) should be submitted in Volume III, however, this conflicts with the Volume V instructions, Section L.4.6.9, on page 28 which indicate this attachment is to be in Volume V. Please clarify the submittal instructions.	Clarification of submittal instructions	RFP Change. See revised Table in L.3.1, Attch_0025 moved to be included with Vol V, Contract Documentation.
2.066	L			6		The government has specified a naming convention for the files. With respect to the Performance Work Statements, there are three file names listed: (1) VendorName_PWS_#_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf (2) VendorName_PWS_IDIQ_RFP-W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf and (3) (1) VendorName_PWS_TO-0001_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf. Will the government clarify the contents of the first PDF? Is the offeror to combine both PWS's into a single PDF for this first file?	Clarification	RFP Change. Section L, para L.3.1, Table revised to remove "Filename: VendorName_PWS_#_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf" as this was an example only and not needed.
2.067	Attachment 0029 Section L.3.1, L.4.2.4	Volume I & Volume V	Attachment 0029	9, 17	Table 4	RFP Compliance Cross Reference Matrix. In L.3.1 table indicates that the Matrix goes into Volume V but in the text of Section L.4.2.4 it still appears to be in Volume I with the IMS, SV-8 and Staffing Matrix.  Will the Government please clarify where it should go.	Clarification	RFP Change. Submit Compliance Matrix with Vol V. See revised Section L, para L.4.2.4 that removed the words "Compliance Matrix" Note that the title and text of L.4.2.4.1 moved to be placed at "L.4.6.12 Compliance Matrix".
2.068	Attachment 0002 TO 0001 SOO		Attachment 0002			CDRL A012 Transition Out is not listed in the TO 0001 SOO; it only appears as a CDRL.  Will the Government please clarify the objectives of the transition out and what CLIN this work is associated with since SOO 6.10 is listed as out of scope for TO 0001 Risk Reduction Phase.	Clarification	RFP Change. Response to Clarification: Correct, CLIN 0010 is not in Scope in Task Order 001. See revised CDRL A012_PHASE_OUT_TRANSITION_PLAN, BLOCK 16. Remarks, BLOCK 12: Initial delivery 30 Days after award of the Transition Out Task Order.  Not applicable to Task Order 0001
2.069	Attachment 0002 TO 0001 SOO		Attachment 0002, Exhibits A thru D, Attachment 0019			When there are discrepancies between a due date of a deliverable does the date specified in the SOO prevail or the date in the CDRL?	Clarification to resolve ambiguity that might result in offerors presenting deliverables with non-compliant timelines	RFP Change. See updated Attch_0019. Response to Clarification: The CDRL Form DD 1423 takes precedence over Attch_0019, which is provided as a summary.
2.070	Attachment 0019 CDRL List Delivery Dates		Attachment 0019			Attachment 19 shows 59 CDRLs for TO 0001 and twelve are marked with TO Success Criteria in Column I. Section 6.0 and Figure 1 (TO Success Criteria) in Attachment 0002 do not appear to correspond to the numbering sequence used in Attachment 0019.  Please explain the derivation and cross-referencing of numbers one through 12 in Attachment 0019.	Clarification	RFP Change. See updated Attch_0019. Removed Numbers 1- 12 in right column to avoid confusion. There was no cross reference intended for Offeror's this was a simple count 1 -12. See revised Attch_0002. Each of the CDRLs that will be used to inform the Government's "Decision Points" for Success Criteria are now annotated with a double asterisk's (** CDRL B005 Technical Review Package)
2.071	Sec. L	Vol. I	0029	17 & 35	L.4.2.4.1 & M.3.2.1.4	Please clarify that the Offeror only needs to include the documents set forth in L.4.2.4.1 - Compliance & Cross-Reference Matrix and does not need also cross-reference with the additional Attachments set forth in Section M, which the Government plans to use for cross-referencing?	Clarification	RFP Change. Submit Compliance Matrix with Vol V. See revised Section L, para L.4.2.4 that removed "Compliance Matrix". See that the title and text of L.4.2.4.1 was moved to be placed at "L.4.6.12 Compliance Matrix".  Clarification Response: Yes. Cross reference is limited to items in L.4.2.4.1, and not the entire proposal.
2.072	Sec. L	Vol. I	0029	12	L.4.2	L.4.2 requires inclusion of a Technical/Risk Introductory Overview with Assumptions in the Technical/Risk volume. Please clarify that this overview is outside of the page count for either Subfactor 1 or Subfactor 2 and, if it is, is there a page limitation on this Overview?	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised reference L.3.1. Proposal Organization, the response for Volume I, Technical/Risk: "Factor - 1 Technical/Risk introductory overview and Subfactor 1 Technical Capabilities:" "Limit of 35 Pages", Thus, the introduction is included in the first section of Vol I and it is included in the "Overall Page Limit for the Entire Technical/Risk Volume" and specifically, "Overall 50 pages, divided as noted by Subfactor 1 & 2."
2.073	Sec. L	Vol. III & Vol. V	0029	11 & 28	L.3.3.5 & L.4.6.11	L.3.3.5 states that no cost or pricing information shall be included in any volume except Volume III, Cost/Price Proposal. However, L.4.6.11 requests the inclusion of proposal incentives, including cost incentives, be included in Vol. V. Please clarify.	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised L.3.3.5.  Clarification Response: The text at L.4.6.11 is correct.
2.074	Sec. L	Vol. I	0029	8 & 28	L.3.1 & L.4.6.9	L.3.1 requests the inclusion of the Software Cost and Data Reporting Plan in Vol. III, Cost/Price, while L.4.6.9 requires that that document be included in Vol. V, Contract Documents. Please clarify the correct location.	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised L.3.1 Table. Attch_0025_ACWS_Cost_and_SW_Data_Rptg_Plan_2016_04_04 is moved to Vol. V, Contract Documents
2.075	Sect L	Vol. II	0029	20	L.4.3.1.5.1	This requirement refers to "Volume II Part D" in our proposal response. It appears all other references to lettered parts in our response have been eliminated in the final RFP. Please Clarify.	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised L.4.3.1.5.1. The reference to "Part D" was deleted.
2.076	I – Contract Clauses	Clause I-120 Un-Limited Rights		25		Please explain the applicability of DFARS 252.227-7022 to this procurement for COTS software. The prescription for this clause states that it is to be used in A/E contracts related to construction efforts.	DFAR Clause / Clarification	RFP Change. Clause removed.
2.077	N/A	N/A	0027	N/A	N/A	Please provide the most recent version of Attachment 0027, ACWS Offeror Self-Certification. In the FRFP, Att. 0027 contains a portion of Att. 0028.	Clarification	RFP Change. See Revised Attch_0027. Updated cover. Replaced TAB: Requirements Worksheet, Replaced TAB: SOO Definitions replaced. Note that this version and the Original (Posted 5 Sept) have multiple Tabs



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
2.078	General					Is the Government developing a bidders' library with all of the referenced technical documents?	If all of the referenced technical documents are not public domain and internet available, we may not be able to review all files.	No RFP Change. All documents referenced are in the public domain.
2.079			0027			Can the Government review Attachments 0027 and 0028 and confirm that the title pages and associated spreadsheets are properly allocated to the correct attachment?	Attachment 0027 Cover Page refers to Attachment 0028	RFP Change. See Revised Attch_0027. Updated cover.
2.080	L.1.1 and L.1.2.1	Ail	0029	1-2		Please clarify Period for Acceptance of Offers. 180 or 730 as stated earlier in section L.1.1 .	Acceptance period conflict.	RFP Change. See revised L.1.2.1.
2.081	L.3.1	Vol. I	0029	5	table	The Table in Section L.3.1 identifies Gate Criteria, Attachments 0027 and 0028. Shall Offerors submit these files as separate documents or, as indicated in the table, shall they be included as part of the Volume I, Attachments, as instructed in section L.4.2? Can the Government provide clarifying instructions?	L.3.1 and L.4.2 instructions appear to conflict with one another.	No RFP Change. Clarification response: Only 1 Copy of Attch_0028 & Attch_0027 shall be submitted IAW L.3.1. and L.4.1 L.4.2 requires that the content of these attachments and others "...must address the Government-provided OV-2_SV-1-Views (Attachment 0008) and the ACWS Interface Development Strategy (Attachment 0010)." This paragraph does not provide instructions for submission.
2.082	L.4.2.1.1.d	Vol I	0001	12	d	Offerors are required to describe the proposed solution's current capability to meet the Key Performance Parameters (KPP) defined in the SOO (Attachment 0001). Can the Government provide an updated SOO with Table 3, the KPPs?	Table 3, Key Performance Parameters is not included in Attachment 0001.	No RFP Change. Please see Attch_0001, Page 9, Table 3: ACWS Key Performance Parameters (KPPs)
2.083	L.4.4.6.1-2, L.4.4.7-9	Vol. III	0029	23-24		Section L.4.4 references, in multiple locations, "Any Subcontractor submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal." Please confirm only cost type subcontractors need to submit independent cost/price proposals (sealed packages) to the government.	Request clarification on Subcontractor submittal requirements.	No RFP Change. If prime contractor can not verify the subcontractors price proposal for price realism, the Subcontractor can send the Government the Price Proposal.
2.084	ACWS Master Software License Agreement Template (MS DOC)		24	1	cover	Title refers to " Based on the DoD ESI Master Agreement Template". Please confirm that a Vendor solution offered via a negotiated and active DoD ESI BPA will be governed by the terms and conditions of that active BPA. Please also confirm that the active BPA agreement can be used to respond to ACWS.	Impacts pre-negotiated terms that are already approved and in place	No RFP Change. A) The Government cannot take a position on a proposal prior to submission. The Government will review the information submitted via the revised Attch_0024 instructions and revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template. B) The confirmation is limited to the extent that the active BPA agreement meets the ACWS Solicitation requirements.
2.085	I – Contract Clauses	Clause I-120 Un-Limited Rights		p.25 of 64		DFARS 252.227-7022 is typically used in Architecture and Engineering contracts related to construction efforts. The government addresses Technical Data Rights and Intellectual Property in the SEP. Please clarify if this DFARS clause applies.	DFAR Clause / Clarification	RFP Change. Clause removed.
2.086	L.3.1	3	25			The requirement to fill out DD Form 2794 lacks specificity relative to the ACWS solicitation. The general instructions contained in 252.234-7003 Notice of Cost and Software Data Reporting System, specify several items of information to be provided by the government which do not seem to be apparently available to date. It further instructs contractors to comment on the Government's CSDR. In addition to time dependent entries (based on contract award date). It is unclear what offerors are expected to provide to the government when submitting this attachment.	Request amplify the guidance for filling out attachment 25.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0025 and included instructions.
2.087	L.3.1; L.4.2.4.1	V; I	29	5, 17	7	The table in L.3.1 indicates that the RFP Compliance Cross Reference Matrix should be in Volume V. However, L.4.2.4.1 indicates that the Compliance and Cross Reference Matrix should be in Volume I. Please clarify.	Clarification	RFP Change. Submit Compliance Matrix with Vol V. Section L, para L.4.2.4 revised to remove Compliance Matrix. Title and text of L.4.2.4.1 moved to be placed at "L.4.6.12 Compliance Matrix".
2.088	L.3.3.5 L.4.5.3.1.f	All IV		11 25		L.3.3.5 directs that cost information may only be included in Volume III, while L.4.5.3.1.f requests total SB participation dollars entered in Attachment 0017. Please provide clarification.	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised L.3.3.5.  Clarification response: L.4.5.3.1.f and Attachment 0017 Total SB participation dollars are both correct as provided.
2.089	L			1 and 2	L.1.1 and L.1.2.1	Please confirm the number of days in SF33 Block 12. L.1.1 seems to indicate 730 days if offerors wish to be considered for alternate selection. However, the following paragraph indicates a 365 day extension will be requested. L.1.2.1 indicates 180 days.	Resolve conflicting instructions	RFP Change. See revised L.1.2.1 for correction deleting 180.
2.090	L			17	L.4.2.4.1	Please confirm that the Compliance and Cross Reference Matrix is part of Volume V even though instructions for it are given under Volume I	Clarification of file submission requirements	RFP Change. Submit Compliance Matrix with Vol V. Section L, para L.4.2.4 revised to remove Compliance Matrix. Title and text of L.4.2.4.1 moved to be placed at "L.4.6.12 Compliance Matrix".
2.091			24			Attachment 24 is part of Volume V and has licence cost information in it. However, L.3.3.5 says cost or pricing information of any kind shall NOT be included in any volume except Volume III, Cost/Price Proposal.	Clarification for location of cost information	RFP Change. See revised L.3.3.5.  Clarification response: Yes, submit Attch_0024 with Vol V
2.092	L			25	L.4.5.1	Please confirm that the Small Business Participation introductory overview is not included in the Volume IV page count.	Clarification of page count	No RFP Change. No confirmation. L.4.5.1 Small Business Participation introductory overview ... - is included in the page count for the Small Business Proposal.  However, see revised L.3.1 Table for other Vol IV changes.
2.093	L			25	L.4.5.4	Please confirm that the Commitment to Small Business response is included in the Volume IV page count, which can be 10 pages itself since the Participation Matrix and SB Certifications are excluded from page count.	Clarification of page count	RFP Change. See revised L.3.1 Table for Vol IV. The Small Business Subcontracting Plan requirement is not included in the 10 page limit for Small Business Proposal.



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
2.094			6		L.3.1	Table in L.3.1 asks for three PWS files. Is it acceptable to submit only one file for the ID/IQ PWS and one for the TO 0001 PWS?	Clarification of file submission requirements	RFP Change. Yes. Submit two (2) PWS files, one (1) each for ID/IQ SOO and one (1) each Task Order SOO.  See revised Section L, para L.3.1, Table that removed "Filename: VendorName_PWS_#_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf" as this was an example only and not needed.
2.095	M		31		M.3.2	Is it acceptable to include evaluated contractor approach details in the PWS documents? And will the government evaluate those approach details as part of Factor 1 if they are only included in the PWS?	Typically a PWS only addresses requirements in terms of what is to be done with associated performance measures (result), rather than how (method) it is done. However, page constraints for subfactors 1 & 2 don't allow for a comprehensive approach description that addresses how each objective in the SOOs will be accomplished across the entire program lifecycle. Allowing some of the approach details to be included in the PWS would remedy that.	No RFP Change. A) Response to Clarification: Yes. Content of the PWS is at the discretion of the Offeror. However, the proposal must meet the all of the requirements of Section L to include L.3.1., L.4.2. and L.4.2.3 B) The Government will evaluate IAW Section M.3.2
2.096	SOO				6.2.e	Would the government confirm into which category Training instance(s) would fall for purposes of planning and execution; if assumed to be included in one of the stated categories, into which would Training instance(s) belong?	The SOO, section 6.2(e) speaks to operating environments expected for ACWS, specifically calling out Development, Test, Production, and COOP. To support the scale of training envisioned by ACWS, separate Training instance(s) may be required. Training environments are typically refreshed, reconfigured, or updated on schedules which differ from those other types of configurations.	No RFP Change. The Government will not confirm or recommend a proposed solution. The RFP files Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO provide the Government's objectives for Operating Environments.  The proposed ACWS Solution Hosting requirements must be submitted in the Attch_0013_DISA_SRF.
2.097	TO 0001 SOO		2	4 and 14		According to the TO 0001 SOO (Attch 2, pg 14 & 15), there are deployment tasks that are required during the risk reduction phase (Planning, Access, and Support). Under which CLIN(s) should these tasks be assigned?	CLIN 6, Solution Deployment is not funded for Task Order 0001 per the notional task order plan on page 15 of the ID/IQ SOO (Attch 1) and page 4 of the TO 0001 SOO (Attch 2). Moreover, it says the CLIN structure is set (fixed) so we are assuming this CLIN cannot be made available for TO 0001.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0020 and Attch_0021 that now allow for pricing of CLINS 0006 and 0008.  See revised Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO, Figure 4 and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO, Figure 2.
2.098	H			40		A) When is the Small Business Subcontracting Plan required?  B) With proposals or post award?  C) If with proposals, please confirm they are not under Volume IV page count.	Clarification of RFP requirement.	RFP Change. A) & B) The Small Business Subcontracting Plan is required with the proposal. See revised L.3.1 Table for Vol IV.  C) Confirmed, not included in Vol IV page count (10 page limit) for Small Business Proposal.
2.099						Are we at liberty to move a given subtask from one part of the PWS to another (vs. the SOO task breakout) if we believe it's better suited to a different section? For example, Operating Environments in the SOO is under Systems Engineering, but in our opinion is better aligned under 6.8, Operations & Sustainment.	Clarifying degree of flexibility allowed to contractor in structuring PWSs.	No RFP Change. Offerors do not have the liberty to move SOO subtasks. Offerors must respond to Solicitation Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO Tasks in the paragraph order provided. This format is required to evaluate the PWS against the requirement.
2.100						In the previous draft RFP the subtask "Baseline Management and Maintenance" was included under O&S, but is removed in this version and not specifically included elsewhere. Would you please explain why it was removed?	Needed to fully understand government's expectations re contractor's responsibility for baseline management.	No RFP Change. The RFP is clear. Offerors are reminded to review and respond to the current Solicitation and all Amendments. Please see Attch_0001 and Attch_0002, Para 6.1 h) Configuration Management, Para 6.2 b) Enterprise Architecture Management and Maintenance, Para 6.2 e) Operating Environments, 6.3.2 d) Capability Configuration 6.3.2 g) Configuration Audits
2.101	SOO		1		2.2 Terms of Reference	RTM is listed as Attach 0004. Is it correct to assume this is now Attach 0005? Same text is repeated in a sheet of Attach 0027 with the Attach 0004 reference.	Clarification of attachment reference.	RFP Change. Yes, the assumption is correct. See revised corrections made in Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO, and Attch_0027 Self Certification
2.102			24		3.4	In "Attch_0024_ACWS_Software_License_Disclosure_2016_04_04_License_Agreement_Template", section 3.4, Authorized Quantity, the text refers to quantities of software units listed in Attachment 0027. Please clarify whether referenced item should be "Attachment 0024", which includes a complete listing of software components, their license types, and quantities licensed to ACWS.		RFP Change. Yes, the sentence revised to read Attch_0024
2.103	CONOPS		0007	56	Section 10.2, 1st paragraph	The last sentence is incomplete. "In addition, we can develop" Please clarify.		No RFP Change. This specific text in Attch_0007 CONOPS, pg. 56, was published as an error. Please ignore it. The CONOPS will not be revised until after contract award.

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
2.104	L	I		2	L.1.2.1	"L.1.2.1 Period for Acceptance of Offers. The Offeror agrees to hold firm the prices in its offer for 180 calendar days from the date specified for receipt of offers. The Offeror shall make a clear statement in SF 33, Section A on page one (1), block 12 of the RFP that the proposal is valid for 180 calendar days. This documentation shall be submitted in Volume V."	Contradicts RFP Para 3.A Proposal must be valid for at least 365 days.	RFP Change. See revised L.1.2.1, replaced 180 with 365 and 730..
2.105	L	II		20	L.4.3.1.5.1	Refers to Volume II Part D. What are parts A, B, and C?		RFP Change. See revised L.4.3.1.5.1. The reference to "Part D" was deleted.
2.106	L	III		20	L.4.4	Factor 3 – Cost/price "ACWS Additional Price Matrix (Attachment 0021) will contain the same base and option ordering period structure as the ID/IQ; however, the Offerors shall price Attachment 0021 to begin 12 months after the ID/IQ Period of Performance has begun." Does this mean the total ordering period for the award is nine years, vice ten years?		No RFP Change. No, Ordering Period 9 years is not correct. Attc_0020 Price and Attch_0021 have the exact same Ordering Periods 12, 48 & 60 Months for a total of ten (10) years.
2.107	ACWS SOO		0001	31	6.11	Will the Government provide some estimate for the quantity, complexity, and deliverables associated with studies, analyses, assessments, and approvals for pricing purposes?	Offerors cannot price "as needed" without this information, except to make an uninformed guess, thus making this an area where Offerors may take risk or "game" pricing.	No RFP Change. The Government will not provide any additional details. Offerors should propose their best approach.
2.108	ACWS SOO		0001	33	7.0	"No task order will extend more than 12 months beyond the fifth year of performance." Should this read "fifth year of ordering period"?		No RFP Change. See Amendment 0001 for previously published revision to Attch_0001 SOO, paragraph 7.0
2.109	TO SOO		0002	2	6.0	Success criteria list doesn't appear to be complete (e.g., training?).		No RFP Change. The RFP is clear. Offerors are reminded to review the current Solicitation and all Amendments. Please see Attch_0002, Page 3 Figure 1., Page 14, Para 6.5 c) Training Delivery
2.110	TO SOO		0002	4		Since CDRL D003 (Deployment Plan) is a required deliverable for TMRR and falls under solution deployment, an unfunded CLIN per Figure 2 in attachment 0002, what CLIN should be used for pricing the effort to develop the deployment plan?		RFP Change. See revised Attch_0020 and Attch_0021 that now allow for pricing of CLINS 0006 and 0008. See revised Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO, Figure 4 and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO, Figure 2.
2.111	L				L.4.4.2	Please confirm that the CLINs requiring detailed cost buildup are CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0005 as stated in Attachments 20 and 21 and not CLIN 0006 as stated in L.4.4.2.		RFP Change. See revised Attch_0020 and Attch_0021
2.112	L	I		SOO P 8	SOO 5.0, Table 2, HLO-5	T&O values refer to NIPRNet, however, this table row is about business objectives on SIPRNet. Should this table entry actually refer to SIPRNet?		RFP Change. See revised Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO, Page 8, Table 2: ACWS Business Outcomes, HLO-5, BO-5-2 was corrected to reflect NIPRNet for Threshold & Objective values.
2.113	ACWS SOO	I		SOO P 12	6.0	Second line of first paragraph references Attachment 10 Contracting Geographic Locations. Should this refer to Attachment 11?		RFP Change. See revised Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO. Reference to Attch_0010 Contracting Geographic Locations was corrected to read Attch_0011 in three locations: Pg 12, 27, 28
2.114	License Template		0024	24	3.2	This provision addresses pricing. Why is this in a license agreement? Please delete this section.	The Government has asked Offerors to provide pricing in a separate volume and not to provide pricing anywhere else. (See attachment 29. "L.3.3.5 Cost or pricing information of any kind shall NOT be included in any volume except Volume III, Cost/Price Proposal.")	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 and the revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template. The references to Price were removed from the Spreadsheet and the Template.
2.115	License Template		0024	24	3.4.1	This section appears to be inconsistent with the pricing structure in the RFP. The Government has requested that our proposed pricing be set forth in Attachments 20 & 21. Please delete this section.	Our pricing, with the discounts provided, will be as proposed in Sections 20 & 21.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 and the revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template. The references to Price were removed from the Spreadsheet and the Template.
2.116	L		0029	11	L.3.3.2	What is the definition of "large" to ensure consistency among all Offerors regarding compliance?		No RFP Change. Per L.3.3.2 Large = "displays shall be uncomplicated, legible, and shall not exceed 11 x 17 inches in size. 11 x 17 inches in size. Offerors are reminded to read the entire solicitation and the context of the paragraphs. `
2.117	L	III	0029	23		To ensure consistency among all Offerors, would the Government agree that any form of written documentation in addition to the four types of documentation listed in L.4.4.5 is acceptable and compliant as long as the documentation substantiates the direct labor rate?	The use of i.e. (meaning "in other words") communicates acceptable forms of documentation that, if provided, would ensure compliance with the requirement. However, the use of etc. (meaning "and so on") indicates that there are other forms of documentation considered acceptable, and thus compliant.	No RFP Change. Other forms of written documentation MAY BE found acceptable and compliant based on Governments evaluation of BOE.



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
2.118	RFP	V	24	3-31		The Solicitation requires offerors to complete and submit Software Licensing Disclosure documents (Attachment 0024). Offerors are required to submit a copy of their proposed commercial software product licenses and to complete the Master ACWS Software License Agreement (Agreement). The parties to the Agreement include the Software Publisher (the SW manufacturer), the Reseller (the offeror), and the Government. The Solicitation also includes a separate CLIN, CLIN 009 Licenses, for offerors to price the commercial software licenses that they propose as part of their ACWS solution. The Statement of Objectives (SOO) states that, while the commercial software product license shall apply, the Agreement shall govern in the event of a conflict between the terms of the Agreement and the terms of the commercial software product license. ...[Comment summarized]... Therefore, we request that the Army revise the Solicitation to remove the requirement for the Master ACWS Software License Agreement in Attachment 0024 and to allow offerors to propose customary commercial software licensing terms.	Commercial Licenses vs Govt Lic	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 and the revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template. The references to Price were removed from the Spreadsheet and the Template.  For precedence in use of the agreement template, see DFARS SUBPART 208.74--ENTERPRISE SOFTWARE AGREEMENTS
2.119	SOO, L.4.4.2, L4.4.3	III	20, 21, 29	P33 SOO P21 and 22	Para # N/A SOO 7.0	Please confirm that the facilities cost is included in the Government's plug number as provided in the Other Direct Cost CLIN of \$1,000,000.	ODC	No RFP Change. Yes, facilities cost is included in the Government's plug number. See revised for other comment Attch_0001 & Attch_0002 for clarification of the facility requirement and definition of NCR.
2.120	L.3 and L.4	III	0020 & 0021	n/a	n/a	In Attachments 0020 and 0021, the CLIN descriptions on the Price Evaluation Summary sheet are correct, but the descriptions of CLINs 0005 and 0006 in both the Individual Builds sheet and the Support sheet transpose the descriptions and the numbering, which yield incorrect calculations on the Price Evaluation Summary sheet. Please correct the Attachment or issue alternative instructions.	Correction to enable accurate CLIN pricing in the Price Matrices	RFP Change Spreadsheet has been updated
2.121	L&M		29		L.4.4.8	If Offeror's have a CAS Disclosure Statement, are they still required to provide Historical Cost Data?	Cost & Price Info	No RFP Change. Yes, each offeror is required to submit Historical Cost Data.
2.122	Attachment 0020 and 0021 Cost/Price Matrix	Volume III	Attachment 0020 and Attachment 0021, SOO Section 6.10	N/A	N/A	Within Attachments 0020 and 0021 the Government provided CLIN 0010 for Transition Out cost but also "activated" CLIN 0001 Program Management and 0002 Systems Engineering Management for Transition Out cost.  Should the contractor propose Transition Out cost only in the Transision Out CLIN 0010?	Clarification	No RFP Change. No. CLINs 0001, 0002 and 0010 are active for Transition.
2.123	Sec. L	N/A	N/A	21	L.4.4.2	Each proposed Build identified on tab "Individual Builds" in Attachment 0020, Price Matrix, under CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0006 requires a separate cost proposal. Each proposed Support identified on Tab Support under CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0006 requires a separate cost proposal.' Please confirm that offerors can provide one cost proposal in a single workbook for all CLINs, 0003-0006.	Clarification	No RFP Change. Yes, offerors can provide one cost proposal in a single workbook for all CLINs, 0003-0006. Note: Attachment 0021 will require a separate cost proposal.
2.124	Sec. L	N/A	N/A	24	L.4.4.11	Please confirm that sealed packages are required from only those subcontractors who are proposed in cost reimbursable CLINS (CLINs 0003, 0004 or 0006)?	Clarification	No RFP Change. Confirmed, see L.4.4.2
2.125	Sec. L	N/A	N/A	24	L.4.4.13	Please confirm that sealed packages from the subcontractors should be sent to the prime for inclusion in the prime's hardcopy proposal submission.	Clarification	No RFP Change. The Government will not direct how a subcontractor submits proposals to a prime.
2.126		Volume III	0017	N/A	Instructions	On the sheet labelled "Instructions," Line 21 says: "This total shall match the Contract Value found in cell number "X9" on Attachment 0005 Cost/Price Matrix." Attachment 0005 Cost/Price Matrix does not exist in the RFP. Please update the file name and cell reference for this new RFP.	Clarification	RFP Change. Attachment 0017 has been corrected
2.127		Volume III	0020 & 0021	N/A	N/A	Individual and Support tabs have CLIN 005 listed as CPFF & CLIN 006 listed as FFP. This is inconsistent with the listing in the RFP. However, the Summary tab has CLIN 005 listed as FFP and CLIN 006 listed as CPFF, consistent with the RFP. Please confirm the contract type for CLIN 005 and CLIN 006.	Clarification	RFP Change. Spreadsheet has been updated
2.128		Volume III	0020 & 0021	N/A	N/A	Please confirm that offerors use the 'Support' cells under CLIN 009 for pricing for SW maintenance.	Clarification	No RFP Change. CLIN 0009 represents SOO Paragraph "6.9 Licenses for Commercial Software". For Software Maintenance, please see SOO Paragraph "6.8 Operations and Support".
2.129	L			8	L.3.1	Will the government also accept a PDF/Word Volume III file for submission of the cost narrative and other supporting documentation?	Current instructions only allow for an Excel file type.	RFP Change. See revised L.3.1 Offerors may submit PDF/Word files for cost narrative and BOE only.
2.130	L			23 and 24	L.4.4.6-L.4.4.12	A) Under what conditions must subcontractors submit an independent Cost/Price Proposal? B) In such cases, should subcontractors submit their hardcopy proposals (sealed packages) directly to the government or include them with the Prime's hardcopy shipment? C) Will subcontractors have access to the AMRDEC Safe Access File Exchange (SAFE) for electronic submissions?	Clarification of RFP requirement.	A) Refer to L4.3.3 B) The Government will not direct how a subcontractor submits proposals to a prime. C) Subcontractors do have access to AMRDEC for file submissions, but must have the naming convention of the PRIME referred to in L.1.2.
2.131	L and M				L-15 and M.3.4.1	Although the FAR Clause - 52.215-20 REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFIED COST OR PRICING DATA AND DATA OTHER THAN CERTIFIED COST OR PRICING DATA (OCT 2010) is stated in the RFP, please confirm that Certified Cost or Pricing Data is not required from the Offeror and its Subcontractors proposal in accordance with Section M.3.4.1.		M.3.4.1 states The Government expects adequate competition and a comparison will be made of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation. However, the USG reserves the right to require submission of certified cost or pricing data or data other than certified cost or pricing data from the offeror adequate to determine the reasonableness of an offer if competition was inadequate for that purpose.

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
2.132	L				L.4.4.7	Please confirm that a DCAA/DCMA authorized Forward Pricing Rate Agreement as requested in L.4.4.6 will satisfy the requirement for Budgetary Data in L.4.4.7.		No Change. Confirmed, if the Forward Rate Pricing Agreement covers the entire PoP for ACWS. Any years of not covered by the FRPA requires the data will need to be submitted.
2.133	L				L.4.4.8	Please confirm that a DCAA/DCMA authorized Forward Pricing Rate Agreement as requested in L.4.4.6 will satisfy the requirement for Historical Cost Data in L.4.4.8.		No Change. Confirmed, if the Forward Rate Pricing Agreement covers the entire PoP for ACWS. Any years of not covered by the FRPA requires the data will need to be submitted.
2.134	L				L.4.4.9	Please confirm that a DCAA/DCMA authorized Forward Pricing Rate Agreement as requested in L.4.4.6 will satisfy the requirement for Sales Data in L.4.4.9.		No Change. Confirmed, if the Forward Rate Pricing Agreement covers the entire PoP for ACWS. Any years of not covered by the FRPA requires the data will need to be submitted.
3.000	SOO L.4 J	III	n/a 25 19	16, 17, 35 28 53	Sec 6.1.b, 6.1.j, and 9.0 L.4.6.9 n/a	The SOO and RFP Instructions describe the requirement to provide the Cost and Software Data Report (CSDR), DD Form 2794, Attachment 0025. The text of the SOO and RFP, along with the Attachment 0019 CDRL List, indicate that the associated DD Forms 1921, 1921-1, and 1921-3 are to be submitted during contract performance according to schedules defined in the Data Item Descriptions for the forms (DI-FNCL-81565C, DI-FNCL-81566C, and DI-FNCL-81765B) and listed in Attachment 0019, CDRLs 0013, 0015, and 0016. However, the DIDs and Section 9.0 also refer to CSDR Manual DoDM 5000.04-M-1 and DFARS 252.234-7003, both of which indicate a requirement to provide DD Forms 1921, 1921-1, and 1921-3 with the proposal. Please clarify that the delivery of these forms is in accordance with the CDRL requirement.	Clarification of submittal instructions	RFP Change. Atch_0025_ACWS_Cost_and_SW_Data_Rptg_Plan has been updated to include the Resource Distribution Table (RDT), RDT Training Briefing from CAPE/DCARC and updated Government work breakdown structure with mapping to the CSDR Plan. In addition, CDRLs A013, A015, A016 are updated to show submission requirements.
3.001	L	Basic Solicitation		25	I-129	Will the Government please provide the related resource distribution table (RDT) associated with the DD 2794 in the solicitation to allow Offerors to propose an approach/solution that is compliant with DFARS 252.234-7004?	DFARS 252.234-7004 Cost and Software Data Reporting System (Basic) requires Offerors to base reporting on the DD 2794 and related resource distribution table. The solicitation does not contain the related Resource Distribution Table and therefore limits the Offeror's ability to provide a complete CSDR plan.	RFP Change. The Resource Distribution Table (RDT) and a briefing that describes the RDT have been embedded in Attachment 0025 / DD 2794.
3.002	L	Basic Solicitation		61	L-14	Will the Government please provide the related resource distribution table (RDT) associated with the DD 2794 in the solicitation to allow Offerors to propose an approach/solution that is compliant with DFARS 252.234-7003?	DFARS 252.234-7003 states that the Government-approved CSDR, DD-2794 and the associated resource distribution table are included in the solicitation, but the RDT is not included in either the base solicitation or amendment 0001.	RFP Change. The Resource Distribution Table (RDT) and a briefing that describes the RDT have been embedded in Attachment 0025 / DD 2794.
3.003	L	Basic Solicitation		61	L-14	Will the Government please provide instructions regarding where (which volume?) the Offeror's response to the six items required by DFARS 252.234-7003 should be included?	DFARS 252.234-7003 requires Offerors to submit narrative addressing five specific items and complete DD Form 1921 and 1921-1 as part of the proposal, but section L does not indicate which volume this narrative should be included in or provide associated page count limits for this content.	RFP Change. Section L (L.3.1) has been updated to state the CSDR Plan is to be submitted with Volume V.
3.004	L	Basic Solicitation		61	L-14	Will the Government please provide the CWBS dictionary related to the WBS included in the DD form 2794 found in the solicitation in order for Offerors to adequately assess the CSDR and comply with the requirements of DFARS 252.234-7003(b)(5)?	An Offeror cannot adequately assess the Government-approved CWBS provided in the DD2794 without descriptions of each WBS element. Without a dictionary, an Offeror must guess or assume that the Government's approved CSDR matches the contractor's proposed CSDR.	RFP Change. The Government ACWS Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) has been embedded in Attachment 0025 / DD 2794.



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
3.005	L	III	0029	8	L.3.1	Will the Government please provide instructions as to what content and format are required in Attachment 0025 for inclusion in the pricing volume?	Since the DD2794 included in the solicitation has already been completed by the Government, it is unclear if the Offeror should 1) propose a new or modified CSDR based on its proposed plan/solution by filling out a new DD 2794 or 2) provide comments regarding the adequacy of the Government approved CSDR per DFARS 252-234-7003. It is also unclear what format this input must comply with.	RFP Change. See revised instructions in Section L.4.6.9.
3.006	L	V	0029	28	L.4.6.9	Will the Government please provide the WBS Dictionary related to the DD2794 included in the solicitation?	In order for an Offeror to provide a CSDR that follows the ACWS WBS and is compliant with Mil-STD-881C, the Offeror must understand the Government's descriptions of the ACWS WBS elements. These descriptions/the dictionary were not included in the base solicitation or Amendment 0001. This is especially significant, as many of the WBS elements in the Government-provided DD2794 are not described by Mil STD 881 C	RFP Change. The Government ACWS Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) has been embedded in Attachment 0025 / DD 2794.
3.007	L	III and V	0029	8 and 28	L.4.6.9 and L.3.1	Will the Government please clarify if Attachment 0025 is to be included in Volume III, Volume V, or both?	L.4.6.9 provides instructions related to attachment 0025 for volume V, but L.3.1 does not show attachment 0025 as a required element of volume V. Conversely, L.3.1 indicates that attachment 0025 should be submitted as part of Volume III, but L.4.4 (Volume III) does not provide any instructions for completing the CSDR.	RFP Change. Section L (L.3.1) has been updated to state the CSDR Plan is to be submitted with Volume V.
3.008	L	III and V	0029	8 and 28	L.4.6.9 and L-14	Will the Government please clarify if the Offeror is to provide a CSDR plan (as indicated by L.4.6.9) or comment on the adequacy of the Government plan as required by DFARS 252.234-7003, or both?	DFARS 252.234-7003 requires Offerors to comment on the adequacy of the Government-provided CSDR, while the instructions in L.4.6.9 require submission of a plan that follows the ACWS WBS. These are two very different requirements	RFP Change. See revised instructions in Section L.4.6.9.
3.009	L	V	0029	28	L.4.6.9	Will the Government please clarify if the Offeror may propose a CSDR that is different, or propose changes, from the DD2794 included in the solicitation?	Per DoD Manual 5000.04-M-1 (Nov 4, 2011), enclosure 2, page 15, Offerors on a contract where a CSDR is included in the solicitation may propose changes to the contract CSDR plan provided in the RFP and related supporting documents.	RFP Change. Yes, see revised instructions in Section L.4.6.9.
3.010	L	V	0029	28	L.4.6.9	If Offerors are permitted to propose a different contract WBS or propose changes to the Government WBS and submit related supporting documents, will the Government please provide instructions for content, format, and how they will be evaluated?	Per DoD Manual 5000.04-M-1 (Nov 4, 2011), enclosure 2, page 15, Offerors on a contract where a CSDR is included in the solicitation may propose changes to the contract CSDR plan provided in the RFP and related supporting documents.	RFP Change. See revised instructions in Section L.4.6.9. The Offeror will be assessed for compliance only.

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
3.011	L & M		29	section L Pages 15-17; Section M pages 35-36	L.4.2.1.5 & M.3.2.1.5	Multiple Offeror's are proposing the same contract writing software/product. As the Army evaluators become familiar with the product during multiple demonstrations, later presenters may realize a competitive advantage since the evaluators will have asked clarifying questions of earlier presenters, leaving more time for presenters to demonstrate their capabilities. Has the Army considered how to level the playing field in this situation?	Fairness in Capability Demonstration evaluation.	RFP Change. The Government has taken several steps to mitigate competitive advantage. See Atch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information. See Section L.4.2.1.5.1 Technology Demonstration #8 revision.
3.012	L		29	18	L.4.2.1.5 Technology Demonstration, paragraph 3	Vendors will receive reference data and general scenarios 14 days prior to the demonstration. A) Will the Government provide any specific scenario's prior to the demonstration or only when the vendor arrives for the demonstration? B) Is the Government anticipating providing more than one scenario?	Demonstration	RFP Change. See Atch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information. A) Only when vendor arrives. B) The government will provide a specific script that the Offeror will follow to demonstrate how its product meets the ACWS requirements while executing the 6 core contracting functions. The government will provide the Offeror only one script that will include several sub-parts.
3.013	L			14	4.2.1.5	A) Will there be any restrictions on what A/V equipment that the presenting contractor may use in the Technical Demonstration. B) Additionally, is there a requested number of terminals requested for the Government personnel usability testing portion of the demonstration?	Since "The format, content, and length of the presentation is at the discretion of the Offeror," will the hardware also be at discretion of the Offeror?	RFP Change. See Atch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information.  A) Yes, no projectors, screens or external monitors. The Offeror must provide its own laptop/computer from which to access their COTS-CWS software via the internet connection. All equipment used must be able to be hand-carried into the building by the five Offeror personnel participating in the demonstration in. The government will provide a 50 inch, flat screen television, mounted on the wall, on which the laptop screen will be projected for easier viewing. B) For #8. Government Personnel/Usability, the Government requires access to one laptop/computer. This can be the same computer used by the demonstrators.
3.014	L			15	4.2.1.5.1	Is it acceptable to perform the demonstration utilizing an instance of the FAR compliant COTS-CWS hosted in the non-Federal government Cloud that is identical to the native, web-based architecture?	RFP States "The demonstration must be of a preconfigured, FAR-compliant COTS-CWS product and/or components from an existing Federal user's active implementation(s) in the native, web-based architecture."	RFP Change. Yes, see revised L.4.2.1.5.1 Technology Demonstration for the acceptable preconfigured, FAR-compliant COTS-CWS product.
3.015	Attachment 0028 Offeror Software Solution		Attachme nt 0028			Attachment 0028 Section L.4.2.1.5 Technology Demonstration states that Presenters/Demonstrators will be limited to five personnel.  Does that include non-speaking roles such as the software driver and technical support?	Clarify attendance at the Demonstration	No RFP Change. Yes, the count of "five (5) personnel" includes all personnel attending.
3.016	Attachment 0028 Offeror Software Solution		Attachme nt 0028			Attachment 0028- Section L.4.2.1.5 Technology Demonstration states that Presenters/Demonstrators will be limited to five personnel.  Can Offerors bring different presenters/demonstrators for different days/time periods of the demonstration, not to exceed 5 in the room at any time?	Clarification	RFP Change. See Atch_0026 for details on acceptable Offeror personnel changes within the limit of five (5) in the room at any one time.
3.017	Sec. L	Vol. I	0029	15	L.4.2.1.5.1	This requirement requires that at least one Key Personnel will serve as a presenter at the Technology Demonstration. However, there appears to longer be a requirement to address our proposed Key Personnel in any volume. Please verify that there are no requirements to propose Key Personnel anywhere in our written response.	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised Section L, M, SOO and Atch_0015 where "Key Personnel" Changed to "Key Personnel/Key Positions" and added clarifying language. No Resumes required. Revised L.4.2.1.5, Atch_0001 SOO para. 6.1 d) Personnel Management and the instructions for Atch_0015_ACWS_Staff_Level_Skills_Mix_Schedule_2016_04_04.xlsx. "Key Personnel/Key Positions" are Contractor identified.
3.018	Sec. L	Vol. I	0029	14	L.4.2.1.5	Re: Timing of software demonstration. We understand that demonstrations will be conducted after the initial "Gate" analysis and elimination of unviable solutions. Will the software demonstrations be conducted before, during, or subsequent to the evaluation of offeror technical proposals? Any information on the anticipated scheduling of demonstration would be very useful.	To assist offerors to prepare adequately for their demonstrations.	RFP Change. See new Atch_0026 ACWS Tech Demo Logistics The Government estimates that the approximately three (3) weeks after proposal submission, the first Offeror selected by lottery will be issued the 14 day notice. Thus demonstrations will start approximately five (5) weeks after proposal submission. The Government will schedule one (1) demonstration per week, skipping weeks with holidays. The number of proposals will determine the number of weeks required. The Government estimates all demonstrations will be completed by the end of October 2016.
3.019	L.4.2.1.5.1	Vol. I		15	2	A) Are there any restrictions on the Government networks/systems to access the COTS-CWS demonstration site? B) Can the Government provide additional details on the demonstration logistics? C) Will Offerors have the opportunity, outside of the time allocated to the Technology Demonstration, to set up in the Government environment?	The demonstration will be conducted on Government owned networks and computers.	RFP Change. See Atch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information. A) The government will provide commercial internet (residential speed) access in the conference room. The Offeror will be able to connect its laptop to the commercial router or, if preferred, use the commercial Wi-Fi connection that will also be available in the conference room. The government will provide a password to access the Wi-Fi connection. No other special network security requirements will be imposed. B) See details within Atch_0026. C) See the schedule within Atch_0026. On day one, the conference room will be available to the Offeror at 07:00. The Offeror will have 90 minutes to set up equipment and must be ready to begin the demonstration NLT 08:30.



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
3.020	M.3.2.1.5.1	Techno logy Demo.		36	1	A) To facilitate readiness and preparation for the demonstration, and to anticipate dependencies and other requirements, will the government please identify the expectations for location of the demonstration, available infrastructure, including network connectivity, security and account access requirements, laptop / infrastructure, and projectors, etc. B) Will Offerors have the opportunity, outside of the time allocated to the Technology Demonstration time, to set up in the Government environment and ensure the Demonstration readiness?	To properly prepare and set-up the Technology Demonstration ALL offerors should be provided with ample time to set up their Technology Demonstration and determine compatibility with the Government environment/infrastructure.	RFP Change. See Attch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information. A) The demo will take place on Fort Belvoir. The exact address will be provided in the 14 Day Notice. The government will provide commercial internet (residential speed) access in the conference room. The Offeror will be able to connect its laptop to the commercial router or, if preferred, use the commercial WI-FI connection that will also be available in the conference room. The government will provide a password to access the Wi-Fi connection. No other special network security requirements will be imposed. The Government will provide 1 50" wall mounted TV for the demonstration. Offeror cannot bring in projectors, screens or other A/V equipment.  B) See the schedule within Attch_0026. On day one, the conference room will be available to the Offeror at 07:00. The Offeror will have 90 minutes to set up equipment and must be ready to begin the demonstration NLT 08:30.
3.021	M.3.2.1.5.1	Techno logy Demo.		36	2	Will the Government use the same evaluator resource(s), experienced in contract writing to provide consistency in the evaluation across all demonstrations, especially for the hands on portion of the demonstration (Item #8 - usability as a scoring criteria)?	Using the same evaluation team provides consistency of evaluation for all Offerors	RFP Change. Yes, the same Government person will be used for #8. Government Personnel/Usability. See Attch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information.
3.022	L.4.2.1.5	1		15	1	In addition to the 5 people allowed at the demo. Will the government allow for an additional person to drive at demo?		No RFP Change. The count of "five (5) personnel" includes all personnel attending.
3.023	L.4.2.1.5	1		14	1	Approximately how long after proposal submission does the Government expect the demo to occur?		RFP Change. See new Attch_0026 ACWS Tech Demo Logistics The Government estimates that the approximately three (3) weeks after proposal submission, the first Offeror selected by lottery will be issued the 14 day notice. Thus demonstrations will start approximately five (5) weeks after proposal submission. The Government will schedule one (1) demonstration per week, skipping weeks with holidays. The number of proposals will determine the number of weeks required. The Government estimates all demonstrations will be completed by the end of October 2016.
3.024	L.4.2.1.5	1		14	2	Where does the government intend the demo to take place?		RFP Change. The demo will take place on Fort Belvoir. The exact address will be provided in the 14 Day Notice. See Attch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information.
3.025	L.4.2.1.5	1		14	2	If the demo will be in a Government facility. What equipment will the Government provide?		RFP Change. See Attch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information.  The demo will take place on Fort Belvoir. The exact address will be provided in the 14 Day Notice. The Government will provide a wall mounted 50" flat panel TV for the display, commercial (residential speed) internet access, a podium, microphone, conference table and chairs.
3.026	L.4.2.1.5	1		15	1	Please confirm that offerors can rotate Demo presenters rather than have the same presenters for the entire 2.5 days.		RFP Change. See Attch_0026 for details on acceptable Offeror personnel changes within the limit of five (5) in the room at any one time.
3.027	L.4.2.1.5.1	1		15	2	The government indicates that it will provide offerors with pre-staged reference/master data.  A) For planning purposes could the government provide more detail concerning the nature and expected use of this data?  B) Additionally, since all offerors will not have access to current financial systems, will the government explain its expectations concerning financial <u>systems interface demonstration</u>	Clarification	RFP Change. See Attch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information. A) Fourteen (14) days before an Offeror is scheduled to conduct the Technology Demonstration, the government will provide the Offeror a general scenario and master reference data. The general scenario will include top level details about the scenario i.e., whether it is a Contingency Operation, Weapon System, or other type of Procurement and the type of materiel to be procured.  B) L.4.2.4.1 Technology Demonstration does not require the demonstration of any interfaces; therefore, Offerors are not required to demonstrate an interface to a financial system.
3.028	L		0029	14	L.4.2.1.5 Technology Dem	Re: Timing of Technology Demonstrations. We understand that Technology Demonstrations will be conducted after the initial "Gate" analysis and elimination of unviable solutions. Will the Technology Demonstrations be conducted before, during, or subsequent to the evaluation of Offerors' technical proposals?	Assist Offerors in preparing adequately for Technology Demonstrations. Any information on the anticipated scheduling of Technology Demonstrations would be very useful.	RFP Change. See revised Section L.4.2.1.5 The Government estimates that the approximately three (3) weeks after proposal submission, the first Offeror selected by lottery will be issued the 14 day notice. Thus demonstrations will start approximately five (5) weeks after proposal submission. The Government will schedule one (1) demonstration per week, skipping weeks with holidays. The number of proposals will determine the number of weeks required. The Government estimates all demonstrations will be completed by the end of October 2016.
3.029	L		0029	18	L.4.2.1.5 Technology Demonstration, paragraph 3	Offerors will receive reference data and general scenarios 14 days prior to the demonstration. A) Will the Government provide any specific scenarios prior to the demonstration or only when the vendor arrives for the demonstration? B) Is the Government anticipating providing more than one scenario?		RFP Change. See Attch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information. A) Only general scenario information will be provided in the notice provided 14 days in advance. Specific scenario script will be available on the day of the demonstration.  B) The Government will provide the Offeror only one script that will include several sub-parts.
3.030	L				L.4.2.1.5.1	Subparagraph 8: Is it the intent of the Government to evaluate the usability of the COTS product with personnel who are untrained in the use of the COTS product?		RFP Change. See Attch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information.  The Government representative will have familiarity with the current Army Contract Writing Systems and the contracting process. Although the Government cannot presume the proposed solution or configuration, the Government representative will not have any specific product training or direct exposure to the any of the solutions from Market Research conducted.
3.031	L			Section L P 15	L.4.2.1.5 Technology Demonstration	1. Requirements Development describes the ability to receive requirements in multiple files formats, including "Adobe." Does "Adobe" actually mean Adobe PDF format?		See Amendment 0001 The referenced paragraph was changed to read: "1. Requirements Development: Ability to receive a requirement in multiple formats(e.g., MS Word, MS Excel and Adobe PDF format)."

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
3.032	L		0029	15	L.4.2.1.5 Technology Demonstration, paragraph 3	Vendors will receive reference data and general scenarios 14 days prior to the demonstration. A) Will the Government provide any specific scenarios prior to the demonstration or only when the vendor arrives for the demonstration? B) Is the Government anticipating providing more than one scenario?		RFP Change. See Attch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information. A) Only general scenario information will be provided in the notice provided 14 days in advance. Specific scenario script will be available on the day of the demonstration.  B) The Government will provide the Offeror only one script that will include several sub-parts.
3.033	L		0029	14	L.4.2.1.5	Will the Government define the exact length of time for the technology demonstration?	Inclusion of the word 'notionally' appears to be a leftover from solicitation planning and does not indicate an actual length of time.	RFP Change. Attch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information. The exact amount of time is provided by hour, by day.
3.034	L		0029	15	L.4.2.1.5.1	How much time will the Offeror have to analyze the Script/Scenario prior to the technology demonstration beginning?	RFP indicates that Offerors will have little to no time to plan for or organize themselves to participate effectively in the demonstration. In order to include the right participants, the Offerors must be able to understand the agenda and sequence of events for the demonstration.	RFP Change. Attch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information.  See the schedule within Attch_0026. On day one, the conference room will be available to the Offeror at 07:00. The Offeror will have 90 minutes to set up equipment and must be ready to begin the demonstration NLT 08:30.
3.035	L		0029	15	L.4.2.1.5.1	Will the Government provide an all-inclusive list of requirement formats for the technology demonstration?	The RFP currently indicates that the proposed solution must be able to receive requirements in "multiple" formats, with a few cited examples. This ambiguity leave the Government open to potential protest.	See Amendment 0001 The referenced paragraph was changed to read: "1. Requirements Development: Ability to receive a requirement in multiple formats(e.g., MS Word, MS Excel and Adobe PDF format)."
3.036	L		0029	15	L.4.2.1.5.1	Will the Government allow the Offeror to provide any instruction regarding the software solution such that the instruction time is not counted against the allotted demonstration time?	We understand the need/desire for the software solution to be intuitive in its use, but even the most basic business process COTS information system requires a preliminary orientation to the environment. If the Government does not allow all Offerors equal time to provide this orientation, then Offerors who conduct their demonstration first are at a disadvantage, as the Government participants will "learn" in their demonstration, thus making subsequent demonstrations of similar products seem more intuitive.	RFP Change. Attch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information.  See the schedule within Attch_0026. All Offerors will be given the same amount of time. The use of the time within the schedule is up to the Offeror.
3.037	L		0029	15	L.4.2.1.5.1	Will the Offeror have access to the internet or NIPRNet during the demonstration, and what are the requirements for access?	Internet access bandwidth and security requirements can significantly impair performance of even the most streamlined software when it is hosted off-site, as required for ACWS. In order for Offerors to prepare for the demonstration, they require the technical information to gain access to and understand the limitations of the network used for the demonstration.	RFP Change. See Attch_0026_ACWS_Technology_Demo_Logistics for detailed logistics information. The government will provide commercial internet (residential speed) access in the conference room. The Offeror will be able to connect its laptop to the commercial router or, if preferred, use the commercial WIFI connection that will also be available in the conference room. The government will provide a password to access the WIFI connection. No other special network security requirements will be imposed.
4.000	N/A	I	Exhibit D	N/A	N/A	Training Materials CDRL – Block 16 is blank and there is no identification of when the CDRL is due. Please confirm it is due post award.	Ensure no pre-award requirement	No RFP change. Offerors are reminded to read the current FBO.gov posted Solicitation files and not any previous drafts. Where appropriate, all posted CDRL DD Form 1423's, Block 16 provides the note references for Block 12 and 13. All CDRLs updated to show new PdM Office address.
4.001	Attachment 0002 TO 0001 SOO		Attachme nt 0002	14-15		Under which CLIN should offerors price the technical support related to the ACWS OOTB solution during the Risk Reduction Phase?  This objective is described in both TO SOO Section 6.6 and TO SOO Section 6.8.	Clarification to resolve ambiguity that might result in offerors proposing work under incorrect CLINs	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0020 & Attch_0021. The spreadsheet is corrected to allow for pricing of 6.6 Technical Support and 6.8 Product Support tasks. CLINS 0006 and 0008 ("Planning" in SOOs).
4.002	Attachment 0002 TO 1 SOO, Section 6.5		Attachme nt 0002	25-26		Will the Government state its expectations regarding if ACWS training delivery is to be integrated with ALMS/ATRRS? ( <a href="https://www.atrrs.army.mil/">https://www.atrrs.army.mil/</a> )	Clarification of Government expectation for integrating training delivery functions	No RFP Change. The Government is not mandating or specifying a specific tool for use for training delivery.



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
4.003	Sec. L	Vol. I	0029	14 & 16	L.4.2.1.4 & L.4.2.2.2	Both Technical Capabilities-Solution Deployment, Training, Operations & Support (L.4.2.1.4) and Management Capabilities (L.4.2.2.2) require an overview of the offeror's Training, Deployment & Operations and Support. Since these are separate subfactors, under which subfactor do you want these topics addressed? We respectfully request that the Government add 15 pages to address these items under Subfactor 1, Technical Approach.	Clarification	No RFP Change. No adjustments to page count. Follow the page count allocations and file names in L.3.1.
4.004	SOO		1	28	6.7 and 6.8	Regarding the Army LMS & Knowledge Management Portal: a. Does the government intend for the CBT to be hosted on the Army Learning Management System (ALMS)? b. Or, does the government intend for the CBT to be hosted using Knowledge Management Portal (procurement.army.mil) as the Learning Management System (LMS)? c. Or, is the contractor to expected provide an LMS solution?	Clarify location of ACWS training materials and scope of requirements.	No RFP Change. A) & B) The Government Objectives are stated in the Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO. ALMS is not included in the Objectives or requirements traceability matrix. C) Offerors need to propose their ACWS training delivery solution.
4.005	TO 0001 SOO		2		6.8	Section 6.8 of Attachment 0002 includes "The Operations and Support objectives for this TO: (1) provide operations and support (e.g., break/fix, helpdesk, patches, updates, minor changes, and solution maintenance) of the OOTB solution, keeping the solution viable for the Risk Reduction Phase[.]" (Emphasis added.) However, Attachment 0004 specifies that the O&S CLIN (0008) is not expected to be used during Task Order 0001 according to the notional CLIN structure. Should these activities be included under a different CLIN, or are we at liberty to include pricing for these activities under CLIN 0008 during Task Order 1?	To ensure we allocate pricing to the right CLINS	RFP Change. See revised Attachments 20 and 21 that now allow for pricing of CLINS 0006 and 0008. See revised Attch_0001 Figure 4 and Attch_0002, Figure 2.
4.006	ACWS SOO		0001	12		"System deployment activities, including user training, cannot take place during the fourth quarter of any fiscal year due to the contracting community workload at the end of the fiscal year." Does this restriction apply only to those deployment activities that impact end users at deployment sites, or does it also include any planning and coordination activities in preparation for deployment?		No RFP Change. Clarification response: The restriction applies to deployment activities involving the end users during 4th quarter. Your proposals shall reflect your strategy and rationale.
4.007	ACWS SOO		0001	29	6.8	Help Desk Support. "Also, provide the Tier III support that ultimately allows the user to continue and complete contracting work/processes within a reasonable time." Would the Government please define what is meant by "reasonable time"?		RFP Change: Attch 0001 SOO paragraph 6.8 b) Revised to reflect Tier III support...within the timeframes defined in HLO 6.
5.000	L		29	19	L.4.3.1.4	Please confirm that the administrative data documenting the contract, POC's, place of performance, contact info, etc. are exempt from the 500 words limit.	Clairification of Requirements	RFP Change: All administrative data is exempt from the word limit. See table L.3.1
5.001	L.4.3.1.5 Adverse Contract Performance	Volume II		19	c.	The current description of Adverse Contract Performance appears to apply only to the prime offeror.  Given the importance of the core COTS CWS to the overall ACWS solution, would the Government consider adding a requirement for Adverse Contract Performance for the product vendors of the proposed core COTS CWS?	Improved evaluation of overall solution and associated risk	No RFP Change. The current description of Adverse Contract Performance applies to the Offeror. Reference M.3.3.1.1 The term "Offeror" refers to the prime Offeror and (if any) its subcontractors, teaming partners and Joint Ventures (JVs).
5.002	Attachment 0029 Section L.4.3.1.6 Past Performance Questionnaire	Volume II	Attachme nt 0029			Would the Government accept recent CPARS in lieu of PPQs for cited references?	Clarification to reduce burden on Government Contracting Officers	No RFP Change. It is at the Offeror's discretion to use CPARs from the PPIRS database in lieu of PPQs for cited references.
5.003	L.3.1, L.4.3	2		7, 18		L.3.1 states the following concerning the 2 page Past Performance Summary: <b>"Summary of the Offeror's role and (if any) list of the Subcontractor(s)</b> Corp Names, CAGE code(s) and DUNS." L.4.3. states: "Each Offeror shall submit a past performance Volume II with its proposal containing past performance information in accordance with the format prescribed below. <b>Past Performance introductory overview shall state any assumptions associated with the proposed Past Performance Factor.</b> " while L.4.3.1 and subordinate paragraphs do not include a Summary Section, only a table per L.4.3.2.3 which states: "Table - The Offeror shall provide a table <b>listing each proposed subcontractor's Company Name</b> to include its applicable CAGE Code and DUNS it intends to use in the performance of the ACWS RFP based on L.4.3.1.2.1. Proposed Subcontractor Criteria below." Please provide clarification as appropriate. Including if information required for subcontractors in this volume is for all subcontractors or just those for which we are submitting past performance references.	Clarity - each of these section L references includes different requirements for the Past Performance Summary. It is unclear if information is required for all subcontractors or just those for which we are submitting past performance references.	RFP Change. See revised L.3.1
5.004	L			19	L.4.3.1.5	Please confirm that relevant contracts that experienced any performance problems related to deliverables or services are limited to within the past three years.	Clarify Adverse Contract Performance requirements.	Refer to L.4.3.1.4.1 that states "Recent contract performance is defined as prime contracts, task orders, delivery orders, or first tier subcontracts where the services or deliverables were performed, or are still being performed, anytime within three (3) years of the issuance of this ACWS RFP."
5.005			5, 27	N/A		It is our understanding that grants (DODGARS) is not currently in the scope of the clause logic service (CLS). Based on this understanding, can we assume that they are in scope for future releases of CLS?	DPAP CLS	No RFP change. Offerors are to propose a technical solution and approach that meets ACWS requirements based on the documentation provided within the RFP. Please refer to Attch_0005_Requirements_Traceability_Matrix(RTM)_2015_11_04.xlsx as the requirement. The DODGARS requirement is in the current scope for ACWS. Offerors cannot assume the content of future releases of CLS.

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
5.006			5, 27		PP-BIN-1-1 through PP-BIN-399-4	With the adjustment in the CONOPS indicating the Army's intention to leverage its existing business intelligence capabilities provided by the VCE-BI module (ACBIS), are some of these requirements redundant with existing capabilities? Also, will the Army team retain responsibility for supporting future reporting requirements and maintenance?	Retaining VCE	No RFP change. Offerors are reminded that Attch_0005_Requirements_Traceability_Matrix(RTM)_2015_11_04.xlsx is the requirement. "The Army plans to retain..." on page 54 referenced in the CONOPS is for the Government to transition to ACWS. A) Yes, many of the requirements are redundant, intentionally, to the capability that currently exist within the Government's VCE BI module. As stated in the ACWS RTM, the Offeror's proposed technical solution and approach must include Business Intelligence (BI) capability. B) Leveraging the Army's legacy BI tools will allow users to create reports and dashboards that pull from both legacy and ACWS data sources, supporting analysis that cross fiscal years. SI will be responsible for providing unfettered access to ACWS data and ensure the proper data is fed into Army Data Warehouse systems.
5.007			5, 27	N/A	PI-CLS-8-1, PI-CLS-9-1, PI-CLS-26-1, PI-CLS-27-1, PI-CLS-29-1, PI-CLS-42-2, PI-CLS-43-1, PI-CLS-43-2, PI-CLS-44-1, PI-CLS-44-2, PI-CLS-45-1, PI-CLS-45-2, PI-CLS-46-1, PI-CLS-46-2, PI-CLS-47-1, PI-CLS-47-2, PI-CLS-48-1	We understand the intention of the DPAP CLS solution is to provide a central, standard set of FAR/DFARS/AFARS clauses, with the exception of local clauses. Some of the Army's CLS requirements appear to duplicate or contradict what we understand is currently and planned to be provided for by the DPAP capability. Can we assume that the indicated requirements apply only to local clauses?	DPAP CLS	No RFP change. No. Offerors are to propose a technical solution and approach that meet the ACWS requirements and support end users within the various operational modes and environments referenced in Attachment 0007, CONOPS.  Please refer to Attch_0005_Requirements_Traceability_Matrix(RTM)_2015_11_04.xlsx as the requirement.
5.008			12	N/A	N/A	Would the Army consider providing their preferred database and/or ETL tools as GFE?	GFE	No RFP change. No. Offerors shall propose the tools needed to the meet the requirements of the ACWS RFP as part of their technical solution and approach. Offerors should not propose tools already listed in Attachment 0012.
5.009			5 and 27	N/A	IN-CLSLG requirements	What is the Army's expectation for addressing clause logic for contingency and expeditionary (disconnected) contracting?	DPAP CLS	No RFP change. Offerors are to propose a technical solution and approach that meets the ACWS requirements and support end users within the various operational modes and environments referenced in Attachment 0007, CONOPS. ACWS expects that there are multiple solutions to providing clause logic capability in all modes. Please refer to Attch_0005_Requirements_Traceability_Matrix(RTM)_2015_11_04.xlsx is the requirement.
5.010	IDIQ SOO		1	5	4.0 table 1	Given DoD's Better Buying Power initiatives focus on Life Cycle Cost and affordability, should one of the high level objectives address Life Cycle Cost?	Better Buying Power	No RFP change. Program will be addressing Life Cycle Cost and Affordability through existing HLOs. ACWS HLO-1 Adaptability detail description align to DoD's Better Buying Power initiatives. The HLO-1 describes reads "Apply Better Buying Power initiatives to achieve efficiencies; Implement and maintain an open and scalable architecture that allows for capability enhancements, system adaptability, and technology insertion." (Ref. Table 1: ACWS HLO in ACWS SOO, attachment 001)
5.011	Section L & M		30	40	M3.4 cost and Price	Given DoD's Better Buying Power initiatives and the focus on Life Cycle Cost, should the cost/price evaluation criteria include ways to reduce the ACWS Life Cycle Costs?	Better Buying Power	No RFP change. The ACWS Requirements (specifically HLO-1) and Solicitation considered the Better Buying Power Initiatives prior to publication. The criteria evaluation of the Factor 3 Cost/Price was not changed.
5.012	IDIQ SOO		1	29	6.8 (b)	Our understanding is that today, both Army SPS and PAADS leverage the Army Enterprise Service Desk (AESD) for tier 1 help desk support. The RFP explicitly indicates not leveraging this capability. In the interest of cost savings, would the Army consider leveraging the AESD for ACWS support, including their ticket tracking solution?	Help Desk	No RFP change. Offerors shall propose their strategy solution for a Help Desk to meet the RFP requirements. As stated in RFP attachment 1, pg. 29 paragraph 6.8(b) "There is no relationship between the ACWS Help Desk and the Army Enterprise Support Desk. The vendor shall be prepared to provide separate help desk services."
5.013			1	8	BO-6-1	Comparing RFP Attachment 1 Statement Of Objectives (Page 8 BO-6-1 and BO-6-2) with RFP Attachment 5 Requirements Traceability Matrix (Tab Level 2 Business Outcome BO-6-1 and BO-6-2), these Business Outcome requirements have different definitions, thresholds, and objectives. Please clarify the requirement.	Clarification of Requirements	No RFP Change. The SOO was updated after the RTM was signed. The Government acknowledges that the HLOs in the SOO contain language that conflicts with the RTM. Specifically, the thresholds referenced in Attachment 001 SOO for BO 6-1 and 6-2 are correct and the reference to Table 1: ACWS High Level Objectives in Attachment 0001, take precedence over the HLOs reference in the RTM.
5.014	CONOPS	6.4.1 PR Transaction Data	7	p. 37	Table 18	What is the Army's business process for Requisitions (PRs) that might be created or amended in ACWS, do they expect those to flow back to the financial system? Where does the Army expect to maintain the lifecycle on those Requisitions, will that be in ACWS or in the financial system?	CONOPS	No RFP change. Offerors are to propose a solution that will provide manual PR functionality. The SI and Government will define the business rules for manually created PRs during the Risk Reduction (RR) and in conjunction with ACWS financial system partners.
5.015	Offer Self Certification Matrix		27		Short Title: PP-ADM-5-1 And PP-ADM-5-2	Please clarify how a system would calculate re-procurement cost for a terminated line item.	Clarification of requirement	No RFP Change. Based on government established business rules, logic and user provided attributes associated with the procurement instrument, the system will generate a suggested calculation for reprocurement cost. For more context, see Attch_0009 ACWS Business Process Models.
5.016	Offer Self Certification Matrix		27		Short Title:PP-ADM-8-1 And PP-ADM-8-2	Please clarify where the Army would like the system to send vendor past performance data with respect to PIPRS and CPARS.	PIPRS and CPARS do not have interface capability.	No Change. The Government does not have a requirement to "send" past performance information to any other system. The requirements stated in the RTM clearly state that the system shall enable users to access past performance data contained in CPARS, PPIRS and PPIRS-SR. Offerors are to propose a technical approach and solution to meet these requirements.
5.017	Offer Self Certification Matrix		27		Short Title: PP-RUL-9-1	Please clarify the requirement by giving examples of the types of conflicts you refer to in the phrase "conflict resolution".	Clarification of requirement	No RFP Change. Requirement PP-RUL-9-1, speaks to managing data conflicts that may originate across various data elements, workflows and documents on an instrument when ACWS business rules and system logic is enforced.
5.018	SOO				5 (table 2)	Question: Does threshold value for HLO-1/BO-1 of <8 months to implement system change after CCB/PSGB approval include government acceptance testing?	Clarification	No RFP Change. Yes, Government Acceptance Testing must be accomplished within the threshold time standard.



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
5.019	SOO				5 (table 2)	<p>Question:</p> <p>A) Request confirm government's intent to not conduct CCB/PSGDs during the months of November, December, and January?</p> <p>B) Threshold value of HLO-1/BO-1 is less than 8 months from CCB/PSGB approval; any changes approved in November, December, and January could, and likely will, be deployed in Q4 of the FY to meet threshold value; however, SOO paragraph 6 states "System deployment activities, including user training, cannot take place during the fourth quarter of any fiscal year due to the contracting community workload at the end of the fiscal year"</p>	Clarification	<p>No RFP Change.</p> <p>A) The Government has not stated any intent to limit the meetings of the C3CB and PSGB in any month.</p> <p>B) Attch_0001 is quoted correctly: "System deployment activities, including user training, cannot take place during the fourth quarter of any fiscal year due to the contracting community workload at the end of the fiscal year."</p>
5.020	Attachment 0007 CONOPS Section 6.1 User Data		Attachment 0007			<p>The Government identifies 10,000 users, both active and less active.</p> <p>Can the Government provide an estimate of the number of active and less active users?</p>	Information for sizing and cost savings	<p>No RFP Change.</p> <p>The government will not provide a valid estimate of the number of less active users. However, the CONOPS provides statistics on the concurrent users and peak times.</p>
5.021	Attachment 0007 CONOPS		Attachment 0007	29	2	<p>The CONOPS on page 29 says to assume 10,000 users. However, Attachment 0011 on the "ebiz SME Count &amp; Contract Type" Tab shows 16,948 estimated users. (This total includes 16,451 users, 312 local system administrators, 177 authorized users, and 8 enterprise users).</p> <p>Will the Government please clarify what figure the Offeror should use for software licensing purposes?</p>	Clarification	<p>No RFP Change.</p> <p>Per Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO Paragraph 3.0 Scope, the scope of the requirement is for ACWS to support "approximately 10,000 end-users." Offerors should use 10,000 users for licensing.</p> <p>Attch_0011, ACWS Contracting Geographic Location and Authorized User List provides additional details a reference to give Offers a landscape view of where Contracting Offices are located, rough estimate of size of the offices and estimated number of users per location. Attch_0011 TAB "ACE Sites and Locations" column L (est # of users per DoDAAC) is a count of users per DoDAAC, not number of CWS end-users. In today's environment, due to the constraints of our legacy systems, an individual user may have several registered account for multiple DoDAACs.</p>
5.022	Offer Self Certification Matrix		0027	Short Title: PP-ADM-8-1 & PP-ADM-8-2		Please clarify where the Army would like the system to send vendor past performance.	PIPRS and CPARS do not have interface capability.	<p>No RFP Change.</p> <p>The Attch_0005 Requirements Traceability Matrix is clear - access data not transmit.</p> <p>See Attch_0010 ACWS Interface Development Strategy for more information on the interface to CPARS.</p>
5.023	Offer Self Certification Matrix		0027	Short Title: PP-SRC-44-1 & PP-SRC-44-2		Will Army please provide the DoD Source Selection Procedures and Army Source Selection Supplement to the DoD Procedures	Clarification	<p>No RFP Change.</p> <p>These are public documents. Please refer to one of the Governments Websites. Here are two links to the FARSITE:</p> <p>DFARS:  <a href="http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/Regs/FAR2AFMCFARS/FARDFARS/DFARS/PGI%20215_3.htm?zoom_highlight=dod+source+selection+procedures">http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/Regs/FAR2AFMCFARS/FARDFARS/DFARS/PGI%20215_3.htm?zoom_highlight=dod+source+selection+procedures</a></p> <p>AFARS  <a href="http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/other/afars/Appendix%20AA.pdf">http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/other/afars/Appendix%20AA.pdf</a></p>
5.024	Offer Self Certification Matrix		0027	Short Title: PP-RUL-9-1		Please clarify the requirement and the meaning of "conflict resolution".	Clarification	<p>No RFP Change.</p> <p>Conflict resolution relates to managing data conflicts that may originate across various data elements, workflows and documents.</p> <p>See Attch_0005, Requirements Traceability Matrix TAB Level 5 System Requirements for PP-RUL-9-1, and see Attch_0009 ACWS Business Process Models for more context.</p>
5.025	Offer Self Certification Matrix		0027	Short Title: IN-COR-XX		Please clarify if the Government would like the system to interface with an existing COR system or provide COR appointment functionality within the system.	The requirements cover both scenarios.	<p>No RFP Change.</p> <p>As referenced in attachment 0027 RTM IN-COR-1-1, ACWS shall interface with DOD COR tool. Offerors are to propose a solution to meet all requirements in each operational mode and technical configurations.</p> <p>See Attch_0010 ACWS Interface Development Strategy for more information on the interface requirements.</p>
5.026	CONOPS	N/A	7		3.6	Please clarify the software requirement for Helpdesk ticket management and training.	Clarification	<p>No RFP change.</p> <p>Please reference Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO for the paragraph "6.8 Operations and Support" for the help desk requirements.</p> <p>The ACWS Solicitation does not contains any specific software or product "name brand" requirements. CONOPS paragraph 3.6.1 states, "The Help Desk Management System will be a Web-based, non-proprietary, incident/case management and customer relationship management system."</p>
5.027	Offer Self Certification Matrix		0027	Short Title: PP-ADM-5-1 & PP-ADM-5-2		Please clarify how a system would calculate re-procurement for a terminated line item	Clarification	<p>No RFP Change.</p> <p>"How a system would calculate re-procurement for a terminated line item" is based on the Offeror's ACWS Solution and/or the Government established business rules, logic and user provided attributes associated with the procurement instrument, the system will generate a suggested calculation for reprocurement cost. For more context, see: Attch_0004 Requirements Traceability Matrix and Attch_0009 ACWS Business Process Models.</p>
5.028	Offer Self Certification Matrix		0027	Short Title: PI-FND-25-1		If a purchase request line item has been attached to a signed instrument, we are not clear on what is now being received from the financial system. Please clarify.	Clarification	<p>No RFP Change.</p> <p>Based on the Offeror's ACWS Solution and/or the Government established business rules and the external financial system. For more context, see: Attch_0004 Requirements Traceability Matrix and Attch_0009 ACWS Business Process Models.</p>
5.029	Attach 0001 SOW	Section 5.0 Business Outcomes	1	Table 2	BO - 3-4	Measurement Column states "The percentage of business process models and templates that have been reduced, simplified or standardized as compared to the As Is state". Threshold Value and Objective Value Column states "T: 15% reduction, simplification or standardization and O: 25% reduction, simplification or standardization". Does the Army have existing measurements for this Business Outcome for the current As Is state?	Establishes starting point for As Is for this Business Objective so the Contractor can adequately measure its progress of meeting and exceeding the Threshold Value and Objective Value.	<p>No RFP Change.</p> <p>The Army does not have existing measurements for this Business Outcome for the current As Is state.</p>
5.030	CONOPS		7	9	3.6.1	Will tier 1 support use the Enterprise Service Help Desk?	Will impact licensing solutions	<p>No RFP change.</p> <p>Offerors shall propose their strategy solution for a Help Desk to meet the RFP requirements. As stated in RFP Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO, page 29, paragraph 6.8(b) "There is no relationship between the ACWS Help Desk and the Army Enterprise Support Desk. The vendor shall be prepared to provide separate help desk services."</p>

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
5.031	CONOPS		7	27	Table 5	Will the ACWS solution be required to interface with the Security Cooperation Enterprise Solution (SCES) system for FMS?	Impacts interface planning	No RFP Change. No requirement to interface with Security Cooperation Enterprise Solution (SCES). See Attch_0010 ACWS Interface Development Strategy for more information on the interface requirements.
5.032	CONOPS		7	20	5.7.2	Please confirm that all ACWS functionality is expected to be hosted on a laptop to support operating in a disconnected mode.	Impacts solutioning	No RFP Change. Refer to the requirements listed in RFP Attachment 0005, Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM). There are specific requirements associated with the Disconnected State capability. (Ref. Attachment 001 Statement of Work, Section 6.6 Solution Deployment)
5.033	CONOPS		7	25	5.8	Please confirm that all operating modes described in Table 10 are expected to be using a fully functional network	Impacts solutioning	No RFP Change. ACWS will support all operational modes and the various technical configurations referenced in Section 5.7 of the CONOPS.
5.034	CONOPS		7	28	6.1	Please confirm that the number of users is accurately reflected in Attachment 11 and the number reflected in this paragraph is not the complete user population	Impacts solutioning and pricing	No RFP Change. Per Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO Paragraph 3.0 Scope, the scope of the requirement is for ACWS to support "approximately 10,000 end-users." Offerors should use 10,000 users for licensing.  Attch_0011, ACWS Contracting Geographic Location and Authorized User List provides additional details a reference to give Offers a landscape view of where Contracting Offices are located, rough estimate of size of the offices and estimated number of users per location. Attch_0011 TAB "ACE Sites and Locations" column L (est # of users per DoDAAC) is a count of users per DoDAAC, not number of CWS end-users. In today's environment, due to the constraints of our legacy systems, an individual user may have several registered account for multiple DoDAACs.
5.035	CONOPS		7	32	Table 14 & 15	If the number of users in para 6.1 is inaccurate, are the metrics in Tables 14 and 15 accurate or do we need multiply these by a factor of 1.6?	Impacts solutioning and pricing	No RFP Change. The number of users stated in para 6.1 of the CONOPS is accurate. As stated throughout the RFP documentation, the requirement is for ACWS to support approximately 10,000 end-users. Yes, the metrics referenced in Table 14 and 15 are accurate; no need to use a multiplication factor.
5.036	CONOPS		7	37	6.4.2	Does the Army anticipate that using PRDS will reduce the transaction data used for solicitation transactions	Impacts solutioning and pricing	No RFP Change. No. There is no direct correlation between PRDS and solicitation transaction count.
5.037	CONOPS		7	41	6.5	Please confirm that the Army will adhere to current electronic records retention policies and laws that require maintaining all files for a period of 7 years.	Impacts solutioning and pricing	No RFP Change. See Attch_0005 Requirement Traceability Matrix, Level 5 - System Requirements for details associated with Records Management in requirements under capability ID PP-RM.
5.038	CONOPS		7	57	7	How does RPO impact the Disconnected Users requirement?	Impacts solutioning and pricing	No RFP Change. Offerors are to propose a solution that meet the requirements of the ACWS RFP, to include all operational modes and technical configurations.
5.039	ACWS Offeror Self Certification Matrix		27	Tab Requirements Worksheet	row 1124: PP-SPT-12-1	The requirement is: The system shall enable specified authorized users to access an instrument on a read only basis for a limited period of time. Please confirm that this access requires a different User Mode (compared to CONOPS Table 4) and a unique audit and governance solution. Please describe how this access would be employed.	Impacts solutioning and pricing	No RFP Change. No, Table 4, referenced in the CONOPS is applicable to all requirements listed in the RTM and ACWS Offeror Self Certification Matrix.
5.040	Offer Self Certification Matrix		27		SOO Terms of Reference	The government includes COTS "enhancements" in the same category as "customization." This definition is counter to software industry operating practices and nomenclature where COTS products evolve, providing small and large enhancements to functionality, as part of the core code with costs borne by the software vendor, not as a customization. Will the government consider splitting these two categories into two separate columns and allow for explanations of each in column T?	A customization might take an agency off of the COTS path where an enhancement would become part of the COTS software.	RFP Change. Yes, See revised Attch_0001
5.041	SOO		1	8	5	Please clarify that the use of defects in HLO-6, BO 6-3 in the context of maintainability is intended to only include defects that effect system availability of the solution.	Clarification of the type of defect to be held to a MTTR of < 8 hours.	No RFP change. Both maintainability and reliability are primary components of availability, and the description of maintainability includes the word "defects."
5.042	SOO		1	28	6.7 and 6.9	Is there a requirement to interface in any way with TRADOC with respect to training or materials?	Clarify whether there will be a requirement for the contractor to interact with TRADOC in the development and deployment of ACWS training materials and/or update of existing Army schoolhouse training of contracting professionals.	No RFP Change. No. There is no requirement to interface with TRADOC systems.
5.043	SOO		1	9		The "Support to Military Operations" subfactor on page 9 of the SOO has a threshold of 95% PDS Validation Success Rate, and an Objective of 98%. Does this refer only to the transference of data through the GEX for PDS processing, or the passing of PDS compliance checks for contract actions?  If the latter, these objectives seem incompatible with requirements that permit the override of system constraints, e.g. PI-CLS-8-1, "The system shall enable authorized users to remove or exclude a required clause from an instrument."	For clarification of requirements to ensure best solutioning.	No Change to RFP. The HLO refers to the transference of data through the GEX for PDS Processing.
5.044	Self Certification		27	Row 55	IN-ACPERs-2-1	Requirements worksheet: The requirement number in column H is IN-ACPERs-2-1 whereas the requirement number in column I is IN-ACP-2-1. Please confirm these should both be IN-ACPERs-2-1.	Clarification of requirement number.	No Change to RFP. Yes. The Capability ID is ACPERS. It is the short title that incorrectly refers to ACP instead of ACPERS. If there is a discrepancy between the Capability ID and the Sort Title, the Capability ID takes precedence. See revised instructions for Attch_0027
5.045	RTM		5	Row 47	IN-ACPERs-2-1	Level 5: System Requirements worksheet: The requirement number in column H is IN-ACPERs-2-1 whereas the requirement number in column I is IN-ACP-2-1. Please confirm these should both be IN-ACPERs-2-1.	Clarification of requirement number.	No Change to RFP. Yes. The Requirement ID is IN-ACPERs-2-1. It is the short title that incorrectly refers to ACP instead of ACPERS. If there is a discrepancy between the Requirement ID and the Short Title, the Requirement ID takes precedence. See revised instructions for Attch_0027
5.046	Self Certification		27	Row 157	IN-FBO-1-2	Requirements worksheet: The requirement number in column H is IN-FBO-1-2 whereas the requirement number in column I is IN-FBO-7-1. IN-FBO-7-1 is repeated in Row 160.	Clarification of requirement number.	No Change to RFP. Yes. The Requirement ID is IN-FBO-1-2 It is the short title that is incorrect. If there is a discrepancy between the Requirement ID and the Short Title, the Capability ID takes precedence. See revised instructions for Attch_0027



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
5.047	RTM		5	Row 149	IN-FBO-1-2	Level 5: System Requirements worksheet: The requirement number in column H is IN-FBO-1-2 whereas the requirement number in column I is IN-FBO-7-1. IN-FBO-7-1 is repeated in Row 152.	Clarification of requirement number.	No Change to RFP. Yes. The Requirement ID is IN-FBO-1-2. It is the short title that is incorrect. If there is a discrepancy between the Requirement ID and the Short Title, the Requirement ID takes precedence. See revised instructions for Attch_0027
5.048	Self Certification		27	Row 159	IN-FBO-1-2	Requirements worksheet: The requirement number in column H is IN-FBO-4-1 whereas the requirement number in column I is IN-FBO-4-2.	Clarification of requirement number.	No Change to RFP. Yes. The Requirement ID is IN-FBO-4-1. It is the short title that is incorrect. If there is a discrepancy between the Requirement ID and the Short Title, the Requirement ID takes precedence. See revised instructions for Attch_0027
5.049	RTM		5	Row 151	IN-FBO-1-2	Level 5: System Requirements worksheet: The requirement number in column H is IN-FBO-4-1 whereas the requirement number in column I is IN-FBO-4-2.	Clarification of requirement number.	No Change to RFP. Yes. The Requirement ID is IN-FBO-4-1. It is the short title that is incorrect. If there is a discrepancy between the Requirement ID and the Short Title, the Requirement ID takes precedence. See revised instructions for Attch_0027
5.050	Self Certification		27	Rows 385, 386	PI-CLS-30-1, 30-2	Requirements worksheet: Will the government clarify what constitutes an "embedded clause"?	To determine a proper response to this requirement in the Self-Certification Matrix+G56	No RFP Change. For the ACWS Solicitation Requirements: "embedded clause" refer to a clause that is referenced within another clause; also called a subordinate clause.
5.051	RTM		5	Row 1168 and 1169	PP-SRC-14-1&2	The solicitation requires that "The system shall enable the user to evaluate proposals submitted by multiple parties in a vendor teaming arrangement," and "When evaluating proposals submitted by multiple parties in a vendor teaming arrangement, the system shall enable the user to record a single overall rating." Would the Government please clarify whether a "vendor teaming arrangement" is referring to a contractor teaming arrangement as defined in FAR 9.6 Contractor Team Arrangements or is it referring to a Contractor Team Arrangement using the General Services Administration Schedules or other agency-wide multiple award schedules where each contractor team member has privity of contract directly with the Government? Or is the requirement for both types of team arrangements?	Clarification of requirement to ensure correct designation in the Self-certification matrix.	No RFP Change. ACWS is expected to support all teaming arrangements reference in the FAR, to include FAR 9.6 and FAR 8.4.
5.052	Offeror Self Certification Matrix	I	0027	Short Title: PI-FND-25-1		Please clarify the requirement.	If a purchase request line item has been attached to a signed instrument, we are not clear on what is now being received from the financial system.	No RFP Change. Based on the Offeror's ACWS Solution and/or the Government established business rules and the external financial system. For more context, see: Attch_0004 Requirements Traceability Matrix and Attch_0009 ACWS Business Process Models.
5.053	Offeror Self Certification Matrix	I	0027	Short Title: PP-ADM-5-1 and PP-ADM-5-2		Please clarify how a system would calculate re-procurement for a terminated line item.		No RFP Change. Based on government established business rules, logic and user provided attributes associated with the procurement instrument, the system will generate a suggested calculation for reprocurement cost.
5.054	Offeror Self Certification Matrix	I	0027	Short Title: PP-ADM-8-1 and PP-ADM-8-2		Please clarify where the Army would like the system to send vendor past performance.	PPIRS and CPARS do not have interface capability.	No RFP Change. The Attch_0005 Requirements Traceability Matrix is clear - to access data, not transmit data. See Attch_0010 ACWS Interface Development Strategy for more information on the interface to CPARS.
5.055	Offeror Self Certification Matrix	I	0027	Short Title: PP-RUL-9-1		Please clarify the requirement and the meaning of "conflict resolution."		No RFP Change. Conflict resolution relates to managing data conflicts that may originate across various data elements, workflows and documents. See Attch_0005, Requirements Traceability Matrix TAB Level 5 System Requirements for PP-RUL-9-1, and see Attch_0009 ACWS Business Process Models for more context.
5.056	Offeror Self Certification Matrix	I	0027	Short Title: IN-COR-XX		Please clarify if the Government would like the system to interface with an existing COR system or provide COR appointment functionality within the system.	The requirements cover both scenarios.	No RFP Change. As referenced in attachment 0027 RTM IN-COR-1-1, ACWS shall interface with DOD COR tool. Offerors are to propose a solution to meet all requirements in each operational mode and technical configurations. See Attch_0010 ACWS Interface Development Strategy for more information on the interface requirements.
5.057	ACWS SOO		0001	12		"Can be used to execute basic procurement functions (as defined in Figure)" Please verify that the reference is to Figure 2.		No RFP Change. Yes. The Figure 2 referenced on page 13 of Attachment 0007, CONOPS Section 6.0 is the Notional Software Builds.
5.058	CONOPS		0007	9		Help Desk Management System. Is a widely available COTS-based Help Desk Management System considered "non-proprietary"?		No RFP change. There is no specific software requirement. CONOPS paragraph 3.6.1 states, "The Help Desk Management System will be a Web-based, non-proprietary, incident/case management and customer relationship management system." Reference Attch 0001 SOO, section 6.8.
5.059	L		0001	13	Figure 2	As an enterprise level contracting center for ACC (similar to ACC-APG or ACC-RI), would ACC-Orlando be considered a Sub-Command for the purpose of achieving IOC?	ACC-Orlando is now considered to be a contracting center and is grouped with the other major contracting centers on the ACC website, but it does not appear in the list of Army Procurement Sub-Commands in Figure 2 of the Statement of Objectives (Attachment 0001).	RFP Changed. See revised Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO, Figure 2, ACWS Notional Software Build Plan w/ IO and FD Definitions, added Orlando in light blue-sub command definitions.

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
5.060			0011	1st tab		Will the Government please provide an updated list of the PARCs and HCAs and their contracting span of control/authority for the five Army procuring commands so Offerors may assess the risk, level of effort, and price of organizational change management, solution deployment, and operations and support?	Over the past 5 years the HCA and PARC designations for the Army Contracting Command, Army Corps of Engineers, and MEDCOM have been changed/adjusted to align with mission requirements. In order to effectively assess LOE and price this effort, it is critical to understand both the organizational and contracting lines of authority, which are not always synonymous or intuitive.	No RFP Change. The Government will not provide an updated list of PARCs and HCAs.
6.000	L.3, L.4 and I	IV	29	8-9, 25 40, 51	L.3.1, L.4.5.2 I168, I176	RFP Section L describes the requirement for a Small Business Participation Proposal and sets a 10-page limit. The RFP document, Section I, levies the requirement for a Small Business Subcontracting Plan in FAR 52.219-9 and DFARS 252.219-7003 which drive the page limit over 10 pages. Please consider including the Plan as an attachment to the Volume IV Small Business Participation Proposal.	Clarification of submittal instructions	RFP Change. See revised L.3.1 Table for Vol IV.  The Small Business Subcontracting Plan requirement is not included in the 10 page limit for Small Business Proposal.
6.001	L.4	IV	29	26	L.4.5.4.1	Regarding the requirement to provide documentation supporting the Offeror's commitment to small business, please confirm whether the documentation is included in the 10 page limit for Volume IV or is excluded.	Clarification of submittal instructions	RFP Change. See revised paragraph L.3.1.  Copies of Individual Subcontracting Reports (ISRs) are not included in the 10 page limit for Small Business Proposal. This verbiage was added to paragraph L.3.1, page 9. In addition, Bilateral Teaming Arrangements are not part of the 10 page limit.
6.002	L&M		29	11	L.3.3.5	The requirement states that cost and pricing data of any kind shall not be include in any volume other than Volume III. To be compliant with the requires of VOL IV SB Participation, is it acceptable for the offeror to include the applicable cost/pricing data in this volume?	Cost & Price Info	RFP Change. Revised Section L paragraph to read: L.3.3.5 Cost or pricing information of any kind shall NOT be included anywhere in Volumes I Technical/Risk, II Past Performance, except Volume III, Cost/Price Proposal, Volume IV Small Business and Volume V Contract Documentation.
7.000			5, 27	N/A		Out of the box interfaces to GSA solutions -- SAM, FBO, and FPDS-NG, require accounts to which the contract writing solution can connect. Would the Army provide account information for access to test environments these systems so that the demonstration of these interfaces might be included?	Interfaces	No RFP Change. The Army will not provide any account information for access to interface partners (e.g. SAM, FBO and FPDS-NG) during the demonstration. Interfaces are not specifically required as part of the script. Offerors are expected to be able to demonstrate any capability that they certify as Out Of The Box (OOTB) in Attch_0027.
7.001	Software License Disclosure		24	Tab: Master License Agreement (TEMPLATE)	Reference embedded Word doc: "ACWS Master Software License Agreement Template"	A) Is the Template for "Master Software License Agreement" provided as: a placeholder, a recommendation, an example, or other? B) Is it the intent of Army to negotiate specific terms?	As a software company, we have both a standard Commercial and GSA, Master Software License Agreement, with associated terms. It is unclear as to Army's intent by providing the embedded document.	RFP Change. A) See revised instructions on the cover of Attch_0024 The Master Software License Template shall be used as the format for the terms and conditions the Offeror is proposing for each product license. All headings (within the MS Word file) should be addressed. Each place the Offeror's proposed terms differ from those of the template should be highlighted and explained.  B) The Government reserves the right to negotiate all terms and conditions.
7.002	Offer Self Certification Matrix		27	SOO Terms of Reference		Should the definition of Customization read "Customization <b>excludes</b> Enhancement..."? Under the current wording with "includes" this definition would run directly counter to software industry operating practices and nomenclature. COTS products evolve and proceed continuously, providing small and large enhancements to functionality, as part of the core code with costs borne by the software vendor, not as a customization that would be funded by the government and take ACWS off of the upgrade path. The use of the word "includes" vs. "excludes" would put all future roadmap items as "customizations" which they are not.	A Customization might take an agency off of the COTS path, where as an Enhancement would become part of the COTS software and not require a separate upgrade path.	RFP Change. See revised SOO Terms of Reference where "Enhancement" is no longer subordinate to "Customization" and is now listed as a separate term, 3rd in order of preference.  See revised Attch_0027 that requires Offerors to identify capabilities that are met with "Enhancement."  See revised Section L & M, where "Enhancement" is identified 3rd in preference
7.003			12			Regarding the software tools in RFP Attachment 12 ACWS GFI List - Will the customer provide the vendor the licenses and expect the vendor to install and deploy the software applications on their own HW or is the vendor expected to integrate with the customer's existing environment?	Clarification of Requirements	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0012_GFI_GFP. There is no Government (GFE/GFI) provided software that the Contractor will install or deploy onto Contractor owned hardware. The Contractor will be expected to integrate the ACWS Solution onto the Government Hosting platform.  The revised Attch_0012_GFP_GFI details the GFE Tools, Intended Use, Implementation and the Contractor's Responsibilities.
7.004			12			Please confirm the Government is providing as GFE, software(s) necessary for the hosting environments e.g. operating system, drivers, etc.	GFE	No RFP Change. Yes, the Government will provide the Hosting Environment Hardware and Software through the Offeror's submitted Attch_0013, DISA SRF.
7.005			0024, 0027, 0028			Is it correct that the completion of Attachments 0024, 0027, and 0028, to include providing copies of software license agreements, are for COTS Software being procured under the contract and does not include software provided as government furnished or Open Source Software?	GFE	No RFP Change. Clarification Response: The assumption is NOT CORRECT. See TAB "INSTRUCTIONS within Attch_0024, Row 5: "The Offeror shall provide a comprehensive list of all software (Enterprise and non-Enterprise) proposed under this ACWS solicitation."
7.006			12			Would the government please consider adding Oracle Database Enterprise V12c (with Oracle Data Guard), Oracle RAC V12c, and Oracle Enterprise Manager V12c to the Attachment 12 GFE list if not already considered to be included in the hosting environment like the operating system?	This would preclude an unfair competitive advantage an offeror may have.	No RFP Change. An exhaustive list of GFI Software provided is provided at Attch_0012_GFI_GFP (updated). The ACWS PMO will allow access to these tools. Please ensure Attch_0013 DISA SRF regarding the proposed ACWS Solution hosting environment is submitted as required.
7.007	Attachment 12 GFI/GFE for ACWS RFP Release		Attachme nt 0012			Army did not renew contract with Silanis in 2014 and is going with Adobe. <a href="https://militarycac.com/PDFs/ALARACT_179_2014_Update_on_Army_Migration_to_Adobe_Fillable_Forms_7JUL14.pdf">https://militarycac.com/PDFs/ALARACT_179_2014_Update_on_Army_Migration_to_Adobe_Fillable_Forms_7JUL14.pdf</a> Does the Army have an existing enterprise Electronic Signature product that the SI should use as part of its ACWS solution?	Cost savings and compliance with Army Enterprise	No RFP Change. The Army does not have a preferred existing product for PKI Digital Signatures. The Army requires compliance with DoD Instruction (DoDI) 8520.2.



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
7.008	Attachment 0013 DISA SRF Form Risk Reduction		Attachment 0013			Part 1 - Project Overview blocks #48, #49, #50, #51 do not appear in the SRF Instructions.  Will the Government please clarify.	Clarification	No RFP Change. Offerors are reminded to read the current FBO.gov posted Solicitation files and not any previous drafts. The current DISA SRF Form has instructions for the SI to complete blocks #48 – 51 with known information.
7.009	Attachment 0013 DISA SRF Form Risk Reduction		Attachment 0013	10	Table 8	A) Does the Government want all open source libraries (e.g., Angular, Node.js, Xelon-C, Ehcache, log4j, JAXB-api, 3rd party open source java script files, etc.) used by the software solution to be identified in Attachment 13 and classified as to whether it is approved by DISA?  B) Will the Government please clarify what level of detail is desired? For example, if Apache Axis2 is used, does the Government also want each individual component listed, such as java2wsdl, jaxws, etc.	Clarification	No RFP Change. A) Response is Yes. Please ensure Attachment 0013 DISA SRF is submitted as required.  B) For clarification, it is the Offeror's responsibility to fully explain the proposed solution requirements for hosting.
7.010	Attachment 0013 DISA SRF Form Risk Reduction		Attachment 0013	10	Table 8	Will the Government please provide a list of enterprise software licenses available at DISA for use by the proposed software solution and for which the solution provider will not need to provide licenses (e.g., relational/NoSQL databases, web application servers, etc.)?	Cost Realism	No RFP change. The Government will not provide a list of DISA software. Please ensure Attch_0013 DISA SRF is submitted as required.
7.011	Attachment 0013 DISA SRF Form Risk Reduction		Attachment 0013	10	Table 8	Will the Government please provide a list of approved DISA software including approved open source software products and libraries?	Not readily available to the public	No RFP change. The Government will not provide a list of DISA software. Please ensure Attch_0013 DISA SRF is submitted as required.
7.012	Section L.4.2.1.4		Attachment 0029	14	b.	The Government asks for the Offeror's proposed Configuration Management methods.  A) Does the Government have a list of approved or desired configuration management, application source code archiving and deployment tools (e.g., Git, Jenkins, Puppet, Chef, Ansible, etc)?  B) Should the solution include any CM software to be used, including any necessary licenses?	Clarification	No RFP Change.  A) The Government does not have a list of approved or desired configuration management, application source code archiving or deployment tools.  B) Offerors are required to submit in response to Attch_0024 Software License Disclosure the proposed Configuration Management (CM) software included in the ACWS Solution and in response to L.4.2.1.4.
7.013	Attachment 0002 TO 0001 SOO Section 6.2, Item G		Attachment 0002	8		Please clarify if the Government intended to list item 3 as an outcome of the SRR/SFR per the following "3) determine that the design satisfies end user requirements and capability needs."  This does not appear to be an exit criteria as described in the ACWS System Engineering Plan (Attachment 22). The ACWS System Engineering Plan (Attachment 22) states the Preliminary Design Review is conducted to ensure functionality is represented in a realistic and executable design. Please clarify.	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised Exit criteria in Attch_0002_ACWS_Task_Order_0001_Statement_Of_Objs_2016_05_02.
7.014	Attachment 0001 SOO – Section 6.3.3 Cybersecurity and Program Protection Support, sub-para d) Software Assurance		Attachment 0001			"Leverage, to the maximum extent necessary, automated tools (including Government-provided) to identify and remediate vulnerabilities or weaknesses in the COTS solution and software design/coding." No automated tools are identified.  Will these automated tools be listed in Attachment 0012 – ACWS GFI_GFP List Inventory of Government Furnished Equipment (GFE For ACWS RFP Release)?	Clarification to complete GFP/GFE List	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO paragraph 6.3.3. d) Cybersecurity and Program Protection. The revised paragraphs now read as "Support the Government in order to identify and remediate vulnerabilities or weaknesses in the COTS solution and software design/coding."  Removed the words.. "Leverage, to the Maximum extent necessary, automated tools (including Government-provided)..."  See revised Attch_0012_GFI_GFP.
7.015	Attachment 0022 SEP - Table 15: Systems Engineering Tools		Attachment 0022			SEP - Table 15: Systems Engineering Tools –the following tools are listed in the SEP but not in Attachment 0012 GFP/GFE List: HP WebInspect Dynamic Code Analysis - Identify Application Security Vulnerabilities (during runtime of Web application) SE WIPT; SW Library Scanning Tool (TBD) Software Library check SE WIPT; Configuration Management Tool (TBD) Identify baselines and manage change requests SE WIPT; Risk Register (Microsoft Excel spreadsheet) Risk Management Acquisition WIPT  Will the Government provide these tools?	Clarification to complete GFP/GFE List	No RFP Change. The Government will not provide software listed in the SEP. The only GFI Software is provided in Attch_0012_GFI_GFP (revised) and the ACWS PMO will provide access to the software listed therein.
7.016	Attachment 0027 Offeror Self Certification		Attachment 0027	Requirements Worksheet Tab	N/A	Attachment 0027 Offeror Self Certification - The COTS CWS we are proposing has a future release scheduled that includes functionality that will meet ACWS requirements. This functionality is part of the license agreement and the Army will receive this functionality at no-extra charge. However, in the Attachment 0027 instructions, Offerors must categorize these as a Customization, the least desirable way to meet a requirement. Meeting a requirement with future OOTB capability at no additional charge to the Government is a desirable way to meet an ACWS requirement.  Will the Government please clarify how this benefit will be recognized or rated in the evaluation criteria?	Clarification	RFP Change. See revised SOO Terms of Reference where "Enhancement" is no longer subordinate to "Customization" and is now listed as a separate term, 3rd in order of preference.  See revised Attch_0027 that requires Offerors to identify capabilities that are met with "Enhancement."  See revised Section L & M, where "Enhancement" is identified 3rd in preference

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
7.017	Attachment 0027 Offeror Self Certification		Attachment 0027	Requirements Worksheet Tab	N/A	<p>Attachment 0027 Offeror Self Certification - The COTS CWS the Army will choose may have a future release scheduled that includes functionality that will meet ACWS requirements. This functionality is part of the license agreement and the Army will receive this functionality at no-extra charge. However, in the Attachment 0027 instructions, Offerors must categorize these enhanced capabilities as a Customization, the least desirable way to meet a requirement.</p> <p>By defining Customization to include enhancements to the core code of the COTS CWS that are provided in an application version upgrade, the Government is not recognizing the benefits to cost and schedule from such enhancements. First, there is no cost for the development of these enhancements and second there is a positive schedule impact from not having to address the design and development of the enhancement. Finally there is a long-term cost benefit as the Government does not have to maintain the enhancement. Meeting a requirement with future OOTB enhanced capability at no additional charge to the Government is a desirable way to meet an ACWS requirement.</p> <p>We recommend categorizing and scoring future OOTB functionality higher than Customization.</p>	Improved evaluation of Government cost savings	<p>RFP Change.</p> <p>See revised SOO Terms of Reference where "Enhancement" is no longer subordinate to "Customization" and is now listed as a separate term, 3rd in order of preference.</p> <p>See revised Attch_0027 that requires Offerors to identify capabilities that are met with "Enhancement."</p> <p>See revised Section L &amp; M, where "Enhancement" is identified 3rd in preference</p>
7.018	Attachment 0027 Offeror Self Certification and Attachment 0005 Requirements Traceability Matrix		Attachment 0027	Requirements Worksheet Tab	N/A	<p>Attachment 0027 Offeror Self Certification - Offerors can allocate a requirement to Plug-In/3rd Party. The instructions also state that a requirement can be allocated to only one category. Plug-in/3rd Party software may require configuration and/or customization to meet the ACWS requirements.</p> <p>Will the Government please clarify what is the proper way to allocate a requirement that is going to be performed by a Plug-in/3rd Party software that also needs configuration and/or customization? We recommend requiring identification of configuration/extension/customization associated with Plug-in/3rd Party and adjusting the scoring of Plug-in/3rd Party accordingly?</p>	Improved evaluation of benefits gained from requirements met by Plug-In/3rd Party	<p>RFP Change.</p> <p>Attch_0027 Instructions and Requirements Worksheet tabs were revised to clarify instructions entering Plug-In/3rd Party product name and comments.</p> <p>Please review the instructions within Attch_0027 "STEP 3: Select an "X" from the Cell Drop Down Menu in the MOST appropriate Category Column..." Offeror is permitted to only select one category.</p>
7.019	Attachment 0002 TO 0001 SOO		Attachment 0002	6-7; 10		<p>Under which CLIN (0006 or 0008) should offerors price the work and tasks during the Risk Reduction phase?</p> <p>It is unclear because SOO 6.2, System Engineering Management and Planning lists an objective regarding the establishment of Operating Environments and SOO Section 6.3.2, Solution Development Support, item F lists the objective to Deliver and Install the ACWS OOTB Solution.</p>	Clarification	<p>RFP Change.</p> <p>See revised Attch_20 &amp; Attch_0021, CLINs 0006 and 0008 are now open in the Risk Reduction Phase for planning purposes only.</p>
7.020	CDRL B026					<p>When is CDRL B026 due?</p> <p>The CDRL document states it is due 180 DAC or as specified in TO. TO 0001 SOO states the 3 reports are due no later than 300 calendar days after contract and on or before the PDR.</p>	Clarification	<p>RFP Change.</p> <p>See revised CDRL B026 that was updated to match the Attch_0002 TO 0001 SOO, DD Form 1423 Block 12 Initial Submission of No Later Than 300 calendar days after contract award.</p>
7.021						<p>The Army removed the CDRL to create a Reliability, Availability, and Maintainability (RAM) test report from the list of CDRLs and within the SOO. However, the SEP calls for a RAM Test report and lists it as a CDRL.</p> <p>Will the Government please clarify if this CDRL is required?</p>	Clarification	<p>No RFP Change.</p> <p>The Solicitation Exhibit C contains the CDRLs required for Test and Evaluation. Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO takes precedence over ACWS DRAFT SEP Table 13. The SEP published is a DRAFT, does not reflect the Governments current requirement and will be updated after contract award.</p> <p>Offerors are reminded to review and respond to the current Solicitation including CDRL C004 Coordinated Test Plan and C006 Operational Availability Plan.</p>
7.022	CDRL B020 Configuration Status Accounting Information					<p>CDRL B020 appears to be mislabeled in Task Order 0001 SOO, Section 6.3.2 item G. It is shown as the Software Version Description deliverable. Elsewhere within the RFP, B020 corresponds to the Configuration Status Accounting Information deliverable.</p> <p>Given this discrepancy, will the Government please clarify the CDRLs pertaining to Task Order 0001 SOO within Section 6.3.2 item G.</p>	Clarification	<p>RFP Change.</p> <p>See revised Attch_0002 Task Order SOO updated under 6.3.2. f) ** Solution Delivery, removed reference "[CDRL B020 Software Version Description (SVD)]" since [CDRL B020 Software Version Description] first delivery date is after the Risk Reduction Phase. Note: [CDRL B020 Software Version Description] correct reference is "[CDRL B021 Software Version Description (SVD)] and can be found in the Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO"</p> <p>There is no change to Attch_0002 Task Order SOO Section 6.3.2. g) Configuration Audits.</p> <p>There is no change to Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO Section 6.3.2. f) or 6.3.2. g)</p>



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
7.023	Attachment 0024 Software License Disclosure		Attachment 0024			<p>The Government requires that the Offeror complete Attachment 0024, Software License Disclosure, which requires that licenses for the software disclosed in the attachment be submitted with its proposal. Given the multiple requirements to demonstrate commerciality of the software required to perform the effort, the late inclusion of the ACWS Master Software License Agreement, found in Attachment 0024, is confusing.</p> <p>Many of the terms contained in the ACWS Master Software License Agreement are not compatible with terms under which the offered products are usually sold in the commercial marketplace and conflict with the concept of providing a COTS solution to the Government. Since the Government is requiring a commercial product, the terms under which it is sold should also be commercial. The ACWS Master Software License Agreement removes the essence of a commercial software license. A few examples of conflicting terms include the FAR/DFAR referenced inclusions, unlimited and uncompensated transfer rights, TEDs licenses at no additional cost, and the product warranty start time.</p> <p>We recommend the Government delete the ACWS Master Software License terms in its entirety to solve this discrepancy.</p>	Recommendation	<p>RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 and the revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template. The references to Price were removed from the Spreadsheet and the Template.</p> <p>For precedence in use of the agreement template, see DFARS SUBPART 208.74--ENTERPRISE SOFTWARE AGREEMENTS</p>
7.024	Section H 7. Disclosure of Organizational Conflict of Interest and Attachment 0024 Software License Disclosure		Attachment 0024			<p>In Section 3.6 of the ACWS Master Agreement, Army asserts its Transfer Rights of the software license. Our assumption is that this transfer right is limited to affiliates within the Department of the Army.</p> <p>If that assumption is incorrect, will the Government please modify the notification of transfer to be prior to transfer instead of 30 days post transfer to avoid unforeseen violation of the Organizational and Consultant Conflicts of Interest?</p>	Clarification	<p>RFP Change. See revised Attch 24 - ACWS Master License Agreement Template (revised for other comments).</p> <p>The assumption is correct. For clarification, the meaning of "affiliate" includes all government users as referenced in the CONOPS.</p>
7.025	Software Licensing Disclosure		24	9	5.4	This provision states that the Government will get title to Derivative Works created from the COTS software. Please clarify.	This term appears to conflict with the DFARS clauses listed on page 25 of 64 of the RFP in which the Government receives rights, not ownership, to Derivative Works.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 and the revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template.
7.026	Software Licensing Disclosure		24	24	3.2	This provision addresses pricing. Why is this in a license agreement? Please delete this Section.	The Government has asked offerors to provide pricing in a separate volume and not to provide pricing anywhere else. (see attachment 29. "L.3.3.5 Cost or pricing information of any kind shall NOT be included in any volume except Volume III, Cost/Price Proposal.)	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 and the revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template. The references to Price were removed from the Spreadsheet and the Template.
7.027	Software Licensing Disclosure		24	24	3.4.1	This section appears to be inconsistent with the pricing structure in the RFP. The Government has requested that our proposed pricing be set forth in Attachments 0020 and 0021. Please delete this section.	Our pricing, with the discounts provided, will be as proposed in Sections 20 & 21.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 and the revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template. The references to Price were removed from the Spreadsheet and the Template.
7.028	Sec. L				L.4.2.1.1.b & L.4.2.1.3	"Rationale for the Timing..." is in Sec. L twice, once in Technical Solution and again in Technical Schedule. Please clarify what the Government wishes to see addressed in each section.	Clarification	<p>RFP Change. See revised L.4.2.1.1 Technical Solution b., "timing" replaced with "sequence".</p> <p>Describe the rationale of the methodology planned to meet the requirements (i.e., OOTB, Configuration, Extension, Plug-In/3rd party, Customization or Not Met) and the rationale for the - sequence - associated with those efforts.</p>
7.029	License Template		24	25	5.3	It is not clear as to what exactly is meant by "staffed support service communications" on a 24x7 basis, 365 days per year. Does this mean that someone needs to be always available, responding within the timeframes agreed to in the SLA?	Clarification	<p>No Change.</p> <p>The ACWS License Template is a Template. The reference at paragraph 5.3 for "staff support service communications on a 24x7 basis, 365 days per year" is a response time that the Government inserted to meet the ACWS objectives for HLO-6, BO-6-1 Availability, BO-6-2 Restorability, and BO-6-3 Maintainability once the ACWS Solution is deployed (IAW Attch_0011 GEO Locations).</p>
7.030	Attch_007 CONOPS	5.3.3	7	22		Does the CEFMS support any universally accepted API (application programming interface) to perform the funds check and obligations against it?	API support to protocols like WebServices, XML, SOA may be necessary if funds check and obligations need to be performed in CEFMS.	<p>No RFP Change.</p> <p>The Government provides details for CEFMS in Attch_0010 Interface Development Strategy and Attch_0005 Requirements Traceability Matrix.</p>

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
7.031	I-174	V	00 W52P1J1 6R0058_4 .4.16	47		Would the government please update the date for I-174 252.204-7012 from October 2015 to December 2015?	On December 30, 2015, the DoD issued a second interim rule that updated this clause to provide a grace period for implementation of the NIST 800-171 security requirements. Per, The Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy (DPAP) website, the DFARS interim rule 2013-D018, effective December 30, 2015 supersedes the rule on 8 October 2015."	RFP Change. See revised clause I-174 in Section I.
7.032			12			Would the government clarify what individual software components are being provided as GFE within the HP Application Lifecycle Management (ALM) offering? The URL provided in "Attch_0012_ACWS_GFI_GFP_List_2015_12_17" takes offerors to the main HP ALM site, which lists multiple software components under the ALM umbrella, including ALM Software, Agile Manager, and Quality Center.	Answers will drive the potential inclusion or exclusion of additional ALM software by offerors in order to meet ACWS development and operational needs.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0012 GFP_GFI list. The Government will only provide the Contractor access to Government hosted version of the ALM Tool.
7.033			22	44	2.8	Attachment 22, section 2.8 engineering tools lists some tools as TBD. Are these tools to be provided by the government or the offeror? If government, please specify what tools will be used for Configuration Management and SW Library Scanning.	Some of the tools are not listed on the GFE list, so it is unclear if they are to be priced in offeror's proposals.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0012 GFP_GFI list.  The Government will not provide any of the tools listed in Attch_0022 DRAFT SEP, Section 2.8.  Offerors are reminded that Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO take precedence over the Attch_0022 DRAFT SEP. See Paragraph 6.1 h) Configuration Management and CDRL A008 Configuration Management Plan.
7.034			22	73	4.3.1	The Risk Reduction SEP shows WIPTs for unfunded CLINs in Figure 13 (e.g. O&S). Can the Government clarify what contractor support is needed for the Risk Reduction phase?	Clarification of TO 0001 CLIN usage and support requirements.	No Change. Attch_0002 Task Order SOO defines the Contractor Task Objectives for Risk Reduction. The DRAFT SEP Figure 13 showing the Government WIPT structure is not related to contractor tasks.
7.035			22	20-30	2.3	In "Attch_0022_ACWS_SEP_RR_Draft_2016_04_04", a number of entrance/exit criteria appear for SFR/SRR/PDR which seemingly present disconnects with the SOO for Task Order 001. For example, two entrance criteria for PDR in the SEP are that "Development and Testing environments are established"; however, the SOO for TO#001 ("Attch_0002_ACWS_Task_Order_0001_Statement_Of_Objcs_2016_04_04" 6.3.2(f) lists only preparation and installation of the Development environment in the hosted facility.  Please clarify: 1) that all intended entrance/exit criteria for SFR/SRR/PDR are covered by the scope of work in TO#001 SOO; 2) what is meant specifically by "established" for these environments	Clarify requirements.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0002 Task Order SOO for changes to para 6.2. g) Technical Reviews. 1. Systems Requirements Review.  Offerors are reminded that Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO take precedence over the Attch_0022 DRAFT SEP.
7.036			2 and 22	3 of SOO and 54 of SEP		Is the ATP-1 set of progress described in the SOO for Task Order 001 consistent with the set of expectations referenced in "ATP-1 in Systems Engineering Plan (SEP) pre-ATP-1 for Risk Reduction Phase" document - Table 19: Architecture Products?	To confirm that the reference to ATP-1 in SEP Table 19 should be ATP-2 (aligned with end of Risk Reduction phase)	No change. The Attch_0002 Task Order SOO success criteria is not related to ATP-1 products.  See Attch_0001, Figure 1, ACWS NOTIONAL Schedule, ATP-1 (as Milestone A) will occur prior to contract award.
7.037			22	54		What is the role of the contractor developing/updating the set of architecture products in ATP-1 in Systems Engineering Plan (SEP) pre-ATP-1 for Risk Reduction Phase" document - Table 19: Architecture Products?	Get a better of idea of contractor responsibility	No change. The Contractor has no role in developing/updating anything "pre-ATP-1 for Risk Reduction Phase".  Attch_0002 Task Order SOO defines the Contractor Task Objectives for Risk Reduction.  See Attch_0001, Figure 1, ACWS NOTIONAL Schedule, ATP-1 (as Milestone A) will occur prior to contract award.
7.038			Exhibit B		B012	Will it be acceptable to the government if the SI proposes a standards-based and DoDAF-compliant architecture tool that would be interoperable with ARIS, and which can automatically import/export content into and out of ARIS with complete fidelity?	To ensure that the government is open to the SI proposing a tool that is an alternative to one listed in the GFE attachment.	RFP Change. The Government will not comment on the acceptability of a proposed solution. Offerors are responsible for submission according to their best solution to meet the Solicitation requirements. See revised Attch_0012 GFP_GFI list. See posted (not Changed) CDRL B012 Architecture Viewpoints, Block 16 - Remarks, Page 2, "BLOCK 14: Electronically delivered - architecture viewpoints will be developed and maintained in the government architecture toolset (ARIS)."
7.039			1 and 7		6.2e (Attch 1) and 3.9 (Attch 7)	Would the government please clarify the intended status of the COOP environment – specifically its standby condition: "hot" (full production environment mirror); "warm" (regular updates from production); "cold" (infrequent updates from production); etc.?	Intended use, coupled with stated RTOs/RPOs, may drive product selection and license considerations.	No Change. The COOP environments and conditions (hot/warm/cold) are derivative technical requirements directly related to how the solution meets the HLO-6 requirements.  Offerors are advised to review the objectives for HLO-6, BO-6-1 Availability, BO-6-2 Restorability, and BO-6-3 Maintainability once the ACWS Solution is deployed (IAW Attch_0011 GEO Locations).
7.040			1 and 7		6.2e (Attch 1) and 3.9 (Attch 7)	Would the government please provide information on what DISA products, technologies, and services may be provided as GFE to facilitate upkeep and failover to the COOP environment, such as whether items including storage replication, dynamic IP DNS failover, etc., are offered?	Details may reveal additional product needs or license requirements for vendors.	No Change: The Government will not provide a list of DISA software or hardware. Please ensure Attch_0013 DISA SRF is submitted as required.
7.041			1	18	6.2e	A) Would the Government provide more details pertaining DISA hardware and service offerings available to ACWS?  B) Specifically, the hardware type and operating system (x86 Linux, SPARC Solaris, etc.), machine configuration (max. CPU and memory per server), and support for virtualization (VMware, Solaris Containers, etc.) and another information available to enable offerors to shape product selections?	Specific environment configurations may affect product selection, license delivery and costs, and ultimate solution configuration	No Change: A) & B) The Government will not provide a list of DISA software or hardware. Please ensure Attch_0013 DISA SRF is submitted as required.



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
7.042	Self Certification		27	Row 10	DS-SYS-1-1	Requirements worksheet: Will the government provide information on whether services provided by DISA will facilitate this requirement?	To properly account for DISA services in proposed solution.	No Change. Requirement DS-SYS-1-1 (The system shall replicate data across multiple nodes.) Presents both Hardware and Software requirements that must be met.  Offerors are advised to review the instructions for the response and submission of Attch_0013_DISA_SRF _SRF Form where the form requires inputs for Software and Hardware required.
7.043			24	19		In "Attch_0024_ACWS_Software_License_Disclosure_2016_04_04_License_Agreement_Template", Exhibit 3, p.19, the Offeror is required to indicate a license type for the ACWS software from the types listed (Concurrent User, Processor, Site, Enterprise, etc.). In cases where multiple license types will be applicable for the various software components listed in the matrix in "Attch_0024_ACWS_Software_License_Disclosure_2016_04_04" across the entire lifecycle of ACWS, how should the Offeror complete p. 19? For example, software licensed for the Risk Reduction phase may be licensed on a per-user basis, whereas in Testing/Production/COOP for Builds 1/2/3 the same software would be licensed on a per-processor basis. Please advise.	Affects how bidders will price licenses.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 instructions and revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template. Please see the instructions for the Column L "Quantity" which permits quantity by type.
7.044			24		3.3	In "Attch_0024_ACWS_Software_License_Disclosure_2016_04_04_License_Agreement_Template", section 3.3, the text indicates that the Licensor should warrant that the software component(s) incorporated as Exhibit 3 will meet stated requirements. Furthermore, Licensor should warrant that no additional software component(s) will be required to meet the stated requirements. In the (unlikely) event that during the Requirement Validation and/or Blueprinting phases of Risk Reduction components are identified which are no longer needed, or for which a need was not anticipated by the originally-stated requirements, please incorporate the process by which the Master License Agreement and its exhibits are to be amended into the Master License Agreement itself, especially as it pertains to section 9.12, Integration.	Affects the content of the COTS license agreements.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 instructions and revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template. Any changes to the contract will be handled through the appropriate FAR changes clause.
7.045			24		3.9	In "Attch_0024_ACWS_Software_License_Disclosure_2016_04_04_License_Agreement_Template", section 3.9, Language(s), the text indicates that the listed items are to be provided at no additional charge, including software training and software support services – items which are generally priced and accounted for separately from software licenses. Please clarify the intent of this section.	Affects how bidders will price licenses and support services.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 instructions and revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template. See FAR 52.215-8, Order of Precedence where the Schedule (Sec A-K) takes precedence over the attachment. For ACWS Attch_0001 & Attch_0002 represent Section C for this solicitation.
7.046			24		9.6	In "Attch_0024_ACWS_Software_License_Disclosure_2016_04_04_License_Agreement_Template", section 5.4. As relates to derivative works, the text indicates that the Government may hire others to create "modifications, customizations, or other enhancements to the Software" which would be classified as Derivative Works. Since ACWS is COTS and the Government as Licensee enjoys no rights to source code or rights to modify source code, please clarify what is intended by this paragraph. In addition, the Licensor is explicitly prohibited from claims to any such Derivative Works. Please confirm that ALL parties so involved in creating Derivative Works would also be so prohibited.	Refines expected IP rights under terms of COTS licenses.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 instructions and revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template.
7.047			24		9.1	In "Attch_0024_ACWS_Software_License_Disclosure_2016_04_04_License_Agreement_Template", section 9.1, Order of Precedence: Please confirm that any and all terms and conditions in the Master License Agreement also take precedence over language, terms, and conditions present in the ACWS IDIQ contract, any subsequent task or delivery order, or any other direction from ACWS Contracting Officer, Contracting Officer's Technical Representative, ACWS Program Management, DISA, etc., which could be construed to constitute "any other written or verbal agreement".	Affects how SI's negotiate license agreements with COTS vendors	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 instructions and revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template. See FAR 52.215-8, Order of Precedence where the Schedule (Sec A-K) takes precedence over the attachment. For ACWS Attch_0001 & Attch_0002 represent Section C and also take precedence over this agreement template.
7.048			24		9.6	In "Attch_0024_ACWS_Software_License_Disclosure_2016_04_04_License_Agreement_Template", section 9.6, Termination: please clarify the Licensors' rights as related to non-payment for licenses delivered. A) Does the Licensor enjoy any rights with respect to revocation or termination of Licenses previously issued for which payment has never been made? B) Understanding that licenses delivered as Perpetual shall remain available for Government use IAW this Master License Agreement once license fees have been duly paid, is the intent of this section restricted to Term, Subscription or other types of non-Perpetual licenses?	Clarifies understanding of license disclosure requirements	RFP Change. A) & B) See revised Attch_0024 instructions and revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template.
7.049			22	44	2.8	The ACWS Systems Engineering Plan provided in Attachment 22, lists engineering tools to be leveraged throughout the program lifecycle in Section 2.8, page 44. Table 15 on that page states that "HP WebInspect" should be used for dynamic code analysis. This tool is not listed as a Government Furnished item in Attachment 12. Will the license for this tool be provided as a GFE item or should bidders assume that the necessary licenses should be priced into our proposal?		RFP Change. See the revised Attch_0012_GFP_GFI provides details columns headed "GFE Tools", "Intended Use", "Implementation" and "Contractor's Responsibilities".  The DRAFT SEP, Paragraph 2.8 Engineering Tools, Table 15: Systems Engineering Tools provides a list of tools that the Government WIPTs will use for Government purposes and are not listed as Government Furnished Information or Government Furnished Property.  Offerors should propose tools they need for their ACWS Solution in Attch_0024 Software Disclosure and price them according to Section L instructions.

QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
7.050			22	44	2.8	The ACWS Systems Engineering Plan provided in Attachment 22, lists engineering tools to be leveraged throughout the program lifecycle in Section 2.8, page 44. Table 15 on that page states that "HP ALM" should be used for Test Management. This tool is also listed as a Government Furnished item in Attachment 12. Does the Government provided license(s) for this tool provided provide for an automated testing capability?		RFP Change. See the revised Attch_0012_GFP_GFI provides details columns headed "GFE Tools", "Intended Use", "Implementation" and "Contractor's Responsibilities".  The Government will provide the Contractor access to use a Government Hosted HP ALM instance, not licenses to install HP ALM on Contractor owned equipment.
7.051			22	44	2.8	The ACWS Systems Engineering Plan provided in Attachment 22, lists engineering tools to be leveraged throughout the program lifecycle in Section 2.8, page 44. Table 15 on that page states that several tools will be determined at a later point and that the SE WIPT is responsible for these tools. These specifically include a "SW Library Scanning Tool" and a "Configuration Management Tool" Should propose and price specific tools for these functions or does the Government expect to finalize and procure these tools during the Risk Reduction phase?		RFP Change. See the revised Attch_0012_GFP_GFI provides details columns headed "GFE Tools", "Intended Use", "Implementation" and "Contractor's Responsibilities".  The DRAFT SEP, Paragraph 2.8 Engineering Tools, Table 15: Systems Engineering Tools provides a list of tools that the Government WIPTs will use for Government purposes and are not listed as Government Furnished Information or Government Furnished Property.  Offerors should propose tools they need for their ACWS Solution in Attch_0024 Software Disclosure and price them according to Section L instructions.  Offerors are reminded that Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO take precedence over the Attch_0022 DRAFT SEP.
7.052			22	9	2.2	The ACWS Systems Engineering Plan (SEP) provided in Attachment 22 defines several activities that do not appear to align with the content of Task Order 001 SOO (Attachment 2). A) This includes but is not limited to references in the ACWS SEP to standing up "Test" and "Production" environments at Government-owned and operated data centers? B) Should bidders assume that the SOO attachments take precedence over the draft SEP? C) Will bidder's be evaluated on their compliance with direction implied within the ACWS SEP ?		No RFP Change.  A) & B) Offerors are reminded that Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO take precedence over the Attch_0022 DRAFT SEP.  The DRAFT SEP, Paragraph 2.8 Engineering Tools, Table 15: Systems Engineering Tools provides a list of tools that the Government WIPTs will use for Government purposes and are not listed as Government Furnished Information or Government Furnished Property.  C) Offers will be evaluated against the criteria in Section M.
7.053			22	15	2.2	The ACWS Systems Engineering Plan provided in Attachment 22, identifies a "System Performance Report" in Section 2.2, Table 2, on page 15. A) Can more detail be provided regarding the desired content to support this report? B) Does the Government anticipate that performance and capacity testing will be conducted during the Risk Reduction phase to support this report?		No RFP Change. A) See Exhibit B, CDRL B002 System Performance Report. The Exhibits and embedded CDRL DD Form 1423's provide the requirements for all CDRL Reports.  B) Yes, see CDRL B002, for "Date of Initial Submission".  Offerors are reminded that Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO take precedence over the Attch_0022 DRAFT SEP. The ACWS approved Program Objectives and Contract Objectives are defined in the SOO. .
7.054			22	23	2.3	In comparing the products/artifacts to be reviewed for the PDR as listed in Table 6 of the ACWS Systems Engineering Plan (page 23) with those to be reviewed for CDR as listed in Table 7 of the same document, they are identical. In addition, the level of detail required to produce some of these artifacts identified for the PDR exceeds the exit criteria for the ACWS Risk Reduction phase listed in Table 3 and the required system baseline documentation/technical plans listed within the system engineering guidance of the Defense Acquisition Handbook. Was this the Government's intent or will the targeted artifacts be revised to be more in line with the Defense Acquisition Guidance?		RFP Change. See revised Attch_0002 Task Order SOO for changes to Paragraph 6.2. g). 1. System 1. ** System Requirements Review (SRR)/System Functional Review (SFR), and 2. ** Preliminary Design Review (PDR)  Offerors are reminded that Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO take precedence over the Attch_0022 DRAFT SEP and the Defense Acquisition Guidance.  All Contractor Contract and Task Order Objectives are defined in the Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO and Attch_0002 Task Order SOO.
7.055	Offeror Self Certification Matrix	I	0027	SOO Terms of Reference		Should the definition of Customization read "Customization excludes Enhancement..."? Under the current wording with "includes" this definition would run directly counter to software industry operating practices and nomenclature. COTS products evolve and proceed continuously, providing small and large enhancements to functionality, as part of the core code with costs borne by the software vendor, not as a customization that would be funded by the Government and take ACWS off of the upgrade path. The use of the word "includes" vs. "excludes" appears to be a fundamental mistake, as it would put all future roadmap items as "customizations" which they are not.	A Customization might take an agency off of the COTS path, whereas an Enhancement would become part of the COTS software and not require a separate upgrade path.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO, Paragraph "2.2 Terms of Reference" where "Enhancement" is no longer subordinate to "Customization" and is now listed as a separate term, 3rd in order of preference.  See revised Attch_0027 that requires Offerors to identify capabilities that are met with "Enhancement."  See revised Section L & M, where "Enhancement" is identified as 3rd in preference
7.056	ACWS SOO		0001	8	BO – 6-3 Maintainability	"Average amount of time it takes to efficiently correct defects and/or failures. T: MTTR < 8 hours O: MTTR < 4 hours" A) Does this refer to break-fix activities? B) What level of defect or failure is applicable?		No RFP Change. A) Yes, BO-6-3 Maintainability applies to deployed software and "Break-Fix" activities in the Production Environment.  B) BO-6-3 applies to all levels of defect or failure to deployed software. See Attch_0001 ID/IQ SOO Paragraph 6.8 Operations and Support.
7.057	ACWS SOO		0001	18	6.2 e	The RFP says, "The operating environment during the Risk Reduction phase may be hosted at a Government facility other than DISA and will not be continued beyond MS B as ATP-2." Will the Government provide operation and support services at the facility similar to the support provided by DISA?	Identification of Government-provided support is necessary for estimating resources required during the Risk Reduction phase.	No RFP change. Yes, during Risk Reduction the Government Hosting Facility will provide the same level of operation and support services that is provided by DISA.
7.058	License Template		0024	5	3.61	This provision states: "The Licensee shall have the right under the terms of this Agreement, without additional written consent of the Licensor, to transfer Software Licenses or Licensee's rights to use the Software to an Affiliate of the Licensee (a 'Transferee')." We are unable to find a definition of "Affiliate" in the solicitation. Would the Government please provide a definition for this word used in this context?		RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 instructions and revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template.  To clarify, the meaning of "affiliate" includes all government users as referenced in the CONOPS.



QUESTIONS / COMMENT MATRIX -- ARMY CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM (ACWS)								
? #	RFP SECTION	RFP Vol #	RFP Attch #	PG:	PARA:	COMMENT / QUESTION:	SUMMARY / RATIONALE:	ACWS PMO APPROVED ANSWER / CHANGE
7.059	License Template		0024	9	5.4	This provision states that the Government will get title to Derivative Works created from the COTS software. Please clarify.	This term appears to conflict with the DFARS clauses listed on page 25 of 64 of the RFP, in which the Government receives rights, not ownership, to Derivative Works.	RFP Change. See revised Attch_0024 instructions and revised ACWS Master License Agreement Template.
7.060	L	I	0029	18	L.4.2.4.4	Would the Government verify that the DoDAF Version 2.02, Change 1, dated January 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2015, is the version that applies this ACWS solicitation?		No RFP change. No, the Government will not verify DoDAF Version 2.02, Change 1. Please see the SOO Section 9 for the current compliance reference Version 2.02 dated Aug 2010. For clarification, the 31 Jan 2015 Change 1 version was rescinded.
8.000	TEMP			11	1.3.3.3	Request government complete sentence that begins with the word "The" at end of page 11 in the ACWS Draft Test and Evaluation Master Plan.	Incomplete sentence unclear intent.	RFP change required. See revised ACWS DRAFT Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP), Version 1.01, ^ May 2016, paragraph 1.3.3.3 Systems Engineering Requirements, Page 11, last paragraph line, where the word "The" was deleted. There are no other changes.
8.001	CDRL C001 Requirements Testability Analysis Report					CDRL C001 states the first submission is due 30 calendar days after each Business Process Re-engineering activity.  Please clarify what the Government defines as a Business Process Re-Engineering activity.	Clarification	RFP change required. See revised Exhibit C, CDRL C001, where phrase ".Business Process Re-engineering activity" was deleted.  See Exhibit C, CDRL C001 revised to read: BLOCK 12: First submission is due 45 Days prior to SFR [System Functional Review]. BLOCK 13 : 45 calendar days prior to PDR, then 30 days prior to the end of Risk Reduction. The Requirements Testability Analysis Report shall be maintained throughout all Task Orders. [all other BLOCK 13 & CDRL text unchanged]  See other Exhibit C Changes: CDRL C004 revised to read: BLOCK 12: Initial Submission, 30 Days prior to System Functional Review (SFR). CDRL C006 revised to read: BLOCK 12: Initial Submission, 30 Days prior to System Functional Review (SFR). See revised Attch_0019 Updated with date changes.